

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

MY FRIEND, ERNEST S. PETINAUD

HON. WILLIAM H. NATCHER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 9, 1993

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, instead of "my" friend, I could without any difficulty say "our" friend. Everyone who knew Ernest S. Petinaud liked him and he certainly loved the House of Representatives. He knew as much about the membership of the House during his tenure on Capitol Hill as anyone that has ever served in the House since March 4, 1789.

When you enter H-117, the Members' dining room, you see the name—Ernest Petinaud Room. We honored our friend Ernest S. Petinaud who served his final days as the maitre d' in the Members' dining room for many years and this honor was certainly well deserved. He was never too busy to help find a table for you and the members of your family or for your close associates and constituents. He had a wonderful memory and one that placed him in a position where for many years after meeting the members of the family, he could call the names of the children and the spouse.

Mr. Speaker, Ernest Petinaud, age 88, who retired in 1973 as the maitre d' of the House restaurant died on November 8, 1993 at the Washington Hospital Center of injuries suffered on November 4, 1993 in a fire at his home here in Washington. He was a native of Jamaica and he came to this country and settled in Washington in the mid-1920's. He started out initially in the House restaurant as a busboy and from 1930 to 1938 he served as a steward on ships sailing the St. Lawrence River and the Great Lakes. He then returned to the House restaurant as a waiter and was made maitre d' in 1962.

Our friend, Ernest S. Petinaud, was a Mason and Shriner and he was a member of the Scottish Rite and Plymouth Congregational Church here in our Nation's Capital. His lovely wife, Jeannette Petinaud, died in 1988.

During his service as an employee of the House of Representatives, he established an outstanding record. Words are absolutely inadequate to fully appraise Ernest Petinaud's tremendous love for the most powerful legislative body in the world and his loyalty and love of his country. His service in all of his assignments was marked by a high sense of conscience and duty. His character, his achievements and his faithful service to the members of the House of Representatives will be an inspiration to generations yet to come. He was always thoughtful and kind, and ready to serve and be of assistance and always remembered the birthdays of our membership and those who worked with him here in our Nation's Capitol building. He had, in his work with the House, acquired a high level of competence and special knowledge and his willingness to

share with younger, less experienced members of the staff earned him a reputation as a valuable team member.

Mr. Speaker, since I have been a member of the Committee on Appropriations, I have served as chairman of a number of the subcommittees. One, for the duration of 16 years, was the District of Columbia Budget Subcommittee. During my tenure as chairman of this particular subcommittee, which was the first subcommittee chairmanship I had the honor to serve in, my friend Ernest Petinaud, from time to time, would make suggestions to me concerning our Capital City that were not only beneficial, but accepted. He always believed that Washington, DC was the most beautiful city in the world and notwithstanding the fact that we have some problems here from time to time, none was so difficult that they could not be resolved.

When a complete history of the House of Representatives, beginning with the first day on March 4, 1789 up to the time of the finished product is written, the name of Ernest S. Petinaud certainly must appear. Although never a Member of the House, he loved the House and the leadership on both sides of the aisle.

Mr. Speaker, we have all lost a true friend and a gentleman of dignity and stature who will be long remembered and missed by all of those who had the privilege of knowing him and his many good deeds while serving with us here on Capitol Hill.

I want to express my deepest sympathy to the members of his family.

NAFTA

HON. AL SWIFT

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 9, 1993

Mr. SWIFT. Mr. Speaker, "You're retiring from this place. At least the NAFTA vote will be easy for you," a colleague said to me on the floor the other day. Wrong. Deciding whether to vote for the North American Free Trade Agreement or not is the most difficult vote I will cast in my 16 years in Congress.

My close relationship with organized labor has never been a matter of political convenience. I believe that workers should be able to organize so they can speak for themselves. It is a logical extension of our free enterprise system.

My voting record these past eight terms is strongly pro-labor, and of that I am very proud. But a person cannot agree with best friends, always. I have disagreed with labor from time to time on trade issues. The NAFTA, however, is not just another trade issue, and I have worked hard to understand the thinking of both its supporters and opponents.

The decision has been agonizing because, after meeting with rank and file workers both

at home and here in the Capitol, I am convinced that their opposition to the NAFTA is very real and based upon a certitude that it will threaten their jobs and reduce their standard of living.

In talking with the workers themselves, you quickly see this is not a case of their repeating arguments suggested by labor leaders. There is real fear and real anxiety about the NAFTA.

But that begs another question: How did American workers become so anxious, their confidence in their future become so fragile?

I have had more than one business person express to me their utter consternation at the vehemence of individual workers' opposition to the NAFTA. To business the issue is, to use Lee Iacocca's words from his TV ad, "a no brainer." The fact business people are surprised is, in itself, a little startling in light of labor's opposition to our even negotiating the treaty.

More importantly, the surprise of American business at worker reaction reflects, in a very basic way, a major part of the problem because it demonstrates how extremely out of touch business and industry is with their employees and their lives, aspirations, and anxieties.

If the NAFTA is defeated, this attitude—which ranges from mere disinterest to overt delight with the decline of the lot of organized labor in recent years—will be at the root.

THE ANTI-WORKER ACTIONS OF THE EIGHTIES ARE A MAJOR CAUSE OF ANTI-NAFTA REACTION

Review the record. Labor—and I mean unorganized workers as well as members of unions—has suffered enormous set-backs over the last dozen years or more. Some have resulted from unforeseen events as when the collapse of the Soviet Union resulted in severe cut-backs in many defense-related industries. Some grow out of a determined and active antilabor policy, especially in the Reagan administration.

Specifics? President Ronald Reagan's huge over-reaction to the Air Traffic Controllers' strike. By firing all striking controllers he rejected any effort to resolve the matter amicably. Intentionally or not, he initiated a new era of labor-management conflict.

His firing of striking Government workers encouraged business and industry to take a harder line with their employees—stealing techniques directly from the administration.

Labor responded by trying to pass a bill that would prevent management from firing employees who were engaged in a legal strike. Management set up the cry that this would disturb the "traditional balance" between them and labor. The truth is that Ronald Reagan upset the traditional balance because American industry has really never used the technique before. But the bill that, in truth, would have restored the balance was fought bitterly by both the Reagan-Bush administrations and industry. Now "striker replacement" legislation has support from President Clinton and was

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

passed in the House of Representatives last June, but has not yet passed the Senate.

Look at other efforts to help American workers.

A bill that simply required a company that was actively considering the closing of one of its plants to tell its workers a few weeks in advance, was fought as hard as if it actually prevented plant closures.

The effort to revise the Hatch Act to let Federal Government workers participate in the political life of this country like every other citizen was rejected repeatedly for years. It was only recently passed into law.

Just this year we finally passed a family leave bill which sought to establish for American workers what workers in virtually every other industrialized nation in the world has: The right to stay home to care for family in emergency circumstances without losing their job—and, notably, without being paid. This was opposed bitterly by the Reagan and Bush administrations.

None of these proposals was remotely radical.

And most recently, one of the first actions of the Clinton administration, to try to create jobs in the present recession, was turned down by Congress. The opposition mindlessly cried "Spending!" at a time President Clinton knew we needed to put Americans back to work. Surely its passage would have addressed some of the concerns of working Americans and reduced anxiety enough to make less adamant their opposition to the NAFTA.

Business cannot expect to stick its thumb in the eyes of its workers for more than a decade without a reaction. What goes around, comes around, and relentless opposition to the NAFTA by labor is best understood in the context of relentless opposition to workers' interests.

If the NAFTA is defeated, it will be, in my judgment, the direct result of policies and actions by Government and business over the last dozen years or so which have treated workers with such disrespect and caused such a high level of frustration and worry that labor has no trust left, little faith left, and no capacity to resist the fear of change.

NEW ECONOMIC CLIMATE MAKES NOW A BAD TIME FOR BUSINESS AND LABOR TO FIGHT

All of this has been occurring during a period of jarring transition. Not only has the demise of the Soviet Union changed many economic equations, technology is making the world smaller and demanding major changes in our economic thinking. It is not a matter of whether we want to have a world marketplace. Rather it is that there is a world marketplace and we have to figure out how to function in it.

That requires change.

American industry was slow to embrace change. The best example is probably our automobile industry.

Government is slow to change. Every single one of our trade competitors has a government-private sector cooperative system to advance its best interests. It's called industrial policy. Yet, right up to and through the Bush administration we have adamantly refused to consider such a strategy. We sat here happily believing that others could go into the game with talent and a game plan and we could win

with talent alone, no game plan. What arrogance. What stupidity. Only with the Clinton administration are we beginning to maximize our opportunities in foreign trade by developing strategies to do so.

Further, it must be noted that Ronald Reagan's idea of free trade was to talk about it but not lift a finger to insist on fair treatment in return. His reputation for forceful military policy hid his monumental timidity in trade policy.

That has changed. Under Trade Representative Mickey Kantor the Clinton administration has been pursuing a free-trade policy, but with a vigorous insistence on fair trade response from our trading partners.

And labor has been slow to change. That labor has little control over events that impact on it makes this transition an especially threatening one for workers. But, wishing for the sixties, hoping change will go away, mistaking new challenges for old frustrations or letting the fear of the unknown force you into reactionary policies will not serve the interests of American workers in this changed world.

AND THAT BRINGS US TO THE NAFTA

Into this time of uncertainty and transition comes the issue of the NAFTA.

I have listened to the arguments with care, asked many questions, reviewed many responses. Having tried to understand the natural complexities of the issue, I now try to reduce it back to basics, for that is what policy ultimately is.

Much of the analysis has been little more than "my economist can beat up your economist" which makes it difficult for mere mortals to sort out. But there are some exaggerations and contradictions.

Example: Pro-NAFTA forces say the reason NAFTA will not result in low Mexican wages reducing high American wages to some mediocre level in between is that the entire Mexican economy is no larger than the economy of Los Angeles. Even if the blending were to occur it would have minimal effect on U.S. wages.

Then, pro-NAFTA forces tell you how great it will be for American products to have tariff-free access to the huge Mexican market. Well, I don't know of a company that would not want access to the Los Angeles market under any circumstances. But either the Mexican market is relatively small or relatively large. It can't be both.

My view? It's a modest but worthwhile market. Just as we wouldn't want to exclude ourselves from selling into the LA economy, we should be interested in that of Mexico. Perhaps more important, however, are the economies of the rest of the Western Hemisphere which can follow Mexico in opening up to us. There lies great potential.

Example: What will happen if we defeat NAFTA? I have been assured by pro-NAFTA forces that Mexico will be embarrassed, could not and would not renegotiate and would enter into negotiations for a similar trade agreement with Japan.

Anti-NAFTA forces say, "Of course, they have to say that." But they go on to assure me that Mexico will leap at the chance to renegotiate a better treaty if this one is turned down.

Pro-NAFTA people respond, "Of course, they have to say that."

Who knows what the truth is? I don't. It's speculation on both sides. It does seem reasonable, however, that Mexico would be at least a little miffed at a rejection of the treaty. And, why would Japan not try to exploit that irritation by discussing a treaty that would give them a trade beachhead on our side of the mutual, natural market of the Pacific rim?

THE SUCKING SOUND: WILL THE NAFTA EXPORT JOBS TO MEXICO?

There are a few central issues to each side of the debate. First, the anti-NAFTA side has been worried from the beginning about the loss of high paying American jobs to low-paid Mexican workers if the NAFTA is passed.

Ross Perot has called this, "The great sucking sound."

I have concluded that the sucking sound is, in fact, Ross Perot sucking up to American workers by trying to exploit their fears and anxieties. Perot has, to quote the Washington Post, "spun the public's reasonable anxieties into a web of dark conspiracies, fabricated numbers and fantastic claims."

But think about it. For many industries in America such a move would not make sense because the savings in labor costs would not compensate for the capital expenditure of duplicating in Mexico existing United States plants, the costs of dealing with Mexico's poor infrastructure and, often, the much lower productivity of largely poorly trained Mexican workers. Besides, if Mexico is such a draw, they could have already moved there without a treaty.

Another truth is that for many, many products, labor costs are not the most important consideration. Other costs of doing business exceed labor costs in importance. I've taken a little malicious delight in asking business people who tell me that, why they don't just share that fact with their workers. I get usually only embarrassed hems and haws, but a few have frankly said that such an admission would not be useful when it's time to bargain the next labor contract.

If business has been exaggerating the proportional cost of labor in order to keep wages down, one can forgive workers if, based on that exaggeration, they fear low-wage Mexican competition. But it doesn't make it true.

OUR STANDARD OF LIVING: IS THE NAFTA A THREAT TO IT?

Tied with the wage issue are workers' concerns about their standard of living. We all know that today there are more families where both parents have to work to earn the same standard or living one parent could provide just a few years ago. We all see homeless people on our streets that were not there a decade ago.

However, NAFTA did not cause those problems. Defeating NAFTA will not cure them.

To deal with this disturbing trend in our quality of life is going to require that we do some thing differently. Change always causes uncertainty. Uncertainty causes anxiety. Anxiety can cause timidity. Timidity can prevent one from acting when you need to.

NAFTA, as renegotiated by the Clinton administration, offers the prospects of some positive change in things that have been driving our standard of living down. Defeating NAFTA does absolutely nothing whatever to change the conditions that have led us to our unsatisfactory status quo.

MEXICAN LABOR CONDITIONS: DOES THE NAFTA DO ENOUGH?

Late in the debate a new and very legitimate issue was raised by those who oppose the NAFTA. Pointing to the sorry lot of Mexican workers, the point has been made that the NAFTA does not do as much as we'd like to improve labor laws and working conditions for Mexican workers. Further, the enforcement procedures of the provisions that do exist are too weak, it is asserted.

There is little there to argue with, except that what NAFTA does contain is better than the status quo. It is not often that we can achieve an ideal goal with any single effort. Most goals are achieved a piece at a time. This NAFTA is not where we should stop in efforts to improve conditions in Mexico, but it is a place to begin. This NAFTA does too little. Defeating NAFTA does nothing whatever.

DOES THE NAFTA CREATE U.S. JOBS?

Proponents make huge claims for job creation growing out of the NAFTA. I think these are exaggerated. But I believe that it does move us in that direction. When you cut through the war of economic projections, "expert" analysis and all the rest, what is left is this: we presently have few trade barriers against Mexican goods coming into the country, while Mexico has substantial tariff barriers slowing our exports to them. NAFTA makes those barriers go away. That creates new opportunities for American sales which create jobs. Let's just not exaggerate.

DOES THE NAFTA RECOGNIZE THE NEW ECONOMIC REALITIES?

Most important of all to me is the question: Does the passage or defeat of NAFTA help move the United States aggressively into the new world economic climate?

As a nation, we've had it pretty good most of the time since 1945. We were the industrial nation in the world then. Everyone else had been bombed flat. We bestrode world commerce. And, I believe, we grew to believe that was our birthright—to always lead, to always be first and best. The attitude made us a bit complacent and, in time, we were shocked to find that other nations could create and produce and have strong economies too. We were slow to respond and then spent a precious decade, when we should have been catching up, listening to a President wandering around the south lawn murmuring the mantra of free trade rather than moving us vigorously into effective competition.

That has changed. We have a President now who sees clearly what we must do by the end of this century to assure that the next is another "American" century. The NAFTA, rightly or not, will be seen as a major symbol of whether we are willing to do the things necessary to be a vibrant, successful and prosperous leader in the new world economy.

Passing the NAFTA says "yes." Defeating NAFTA will be interpreted by our competitors as evidence that we are no longer flexible enough to change, no longer confident enough to grasp new challenges and no longer ambitious enough to want to compete with the best.

It will be felt first in GATT and there is no telling when it will be felt last. We must simply acknowledge that this NAFTA is neither ideal nor fatally flawed. Rather it is a step—a nec-

essary step—we have to take on the way to a better future.

For those reasons, I will vote for the NAFTA. But even so, this is not an easy decision: there is yet a caution.

A LAST OBSERVATION

Just as I have suggested that there are serious repercussions if we defeat the NAFTA, I think there are some equally serious things we must prepare to meet if the NAFTA passes.

In effect, I have argued here that organized labor specifically and American workers generally have been "fighting the last war"; the frustrations of the last dozen years or more have so savaged their confidence and optimism, have so threatened their capacity to provide a secure future for their families that they can see the NAFTA only in terms of its risks, not its opportunities.

If that is true, passage of the NAFTA—especially in the short run—is going to send a new wave of anxiety through the working people of the land. You cannot have listened carefully to the rank and file on this issue and mistake their sincerity or their fear.

After one particularly wrenching session in my office with some union folks from home, a young staffer in my office looked at me and said, "My, God. Those people are scared to death."

That is a reality that every NAFTA supporter better deal with. Ours is a time of considerable political unrest. American workers can easily be radicalized. The things they asked for in the eighties and were denied will look like sweet reason itself compared to their demands if workers become completely disassociated from mainstream American political life. We are closer to that right now than I think politicians generally realize. It will come as a thunderbolt of surprise to those leaders of business and industry who even now say they have no idea why workers oppose the NAFTA.

Creation of a radical workers movement including a new political party is not impossible. The capture of their support by politicians who wish to exploit their frustrations is not a technique exclusive to bored and egomaniacal billionaires. All sorts of demagogues can play at that game.

And such political chaos would come at a time we should be tending to other serious business if we are going to compete effectively in tomorrow's world.

Should that unpleasant vision become our future, there will be lots of blame to go around. But it will be a pointless, pathetic argument that can roll along while other nations tie up the markets of the world.

To guard against such an eventuality if the NAFTA passes, the administration and Congress with the active participation of American business needs to signal a new and more balanced attitude toward American workers. It needs to encompass a Government willingness to include labor along with business in forging basic decisions affecting the economy. Government and the private sector must cooperate with labor to find and provide ways to achieve greater economic security for workers during this period of transition. And business, working with labor, must find and implement new models of management that treat workers like the essential players they are, rather than as expendable commodities to be sacrificed at will.

If the NAFTA passes and those things are not done, the victory party will be short and bitter. The NAFTA is not an end. It is a beginning. But its passage will require a whole new agenda—not only for planning our trading policy and strategy, but for addressing the domestic implications of those policies. Secure jobs is what it's all about. Those who envision that goal in the NAFTA have a responsibility to reassure with deeds the promise they see in that approach.

The opponents of the NAFTA, many of whom are my friends, are looking backward. Defeating NAFTA will change nothing for the better. The proponents of the NAFTA are looking ahead. The important questions: Are they looking ahead far enough? And will they follow through?

NAFTA

HON. RON PACKARD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 9, 1993

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Speaker, my colleagues may be interested in an editorial printed in the San Diego Union Tribune which I wrote in support of NAFTA. I would like to submit that statement for the RECORD.

[From the San Diego Union Tribune, Nov. 9, 1993]

SCARE TACTICS USED TO ASSAIL NAFTA

(By Ron Packard)

In his book about the history of our city, author Michael Grant writes, "San Diego, after a long adolescence, has suddenly emerged as a civic Cinderella, ready to take her turn on the international ballroom floor."

Nothing could ring truer. San Diego is poised to lead California out of the economic doldrums. The city is endowed with many resources which will ensure economic leadership into the 21st century. Therefore, I believe we must seize a historic opportunity to capitalize on San Diego's natural gifts. We must support the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) in order to break down barriers and unleash the economic productivity of San Diego, California and the nation.

Many have sought to portray NAFTA as an economic toad. NAFTA opponents have resorted to the usual arguments based on fears and not facts. I would like to enumerate some facts about San Diego's strong stake in passage of NAFTA, and dispel some of these myths about it.

San Diego is the only major U.S. city at the border with Mexico. If an entrepreneur were calculating the benefits that NAFTA would provide to San Diego because of its unique position, he would embrace the agreement as a historic opportunity for our city.

San Diego boasts an educated, young, expanding work force and sound infrastructure and a wealth of high-tech businesses and industries. Nearly 80 percent of all San Diegans in the private sector work for firms of 10 people or less and nearly 90 percent work in firms of 20 people or less. Small businesses, because of their lean structure and an ability to adjust and innovate quickly and creatively, stand to reap huge benefits from exporting their products into the Mexican market of 90 million people, eager for American-made goods.

A report by the Small Business Development and International Trade Center released in 1992 concluded that NAFTA, if enacted, would produce significant benefits for San Diego in every sector. "San Diego is well-placed to become a center of U.S.-Mexican trade and to reap the benefits—as well as sidestep the drawbacks—of the expected increase in border activity."

The San Diego area exports goods and services worth \$1 billion a year to Mexico. In 1992, this figure was 10 percent of San Diego's gross regional product. Lowered tariffs and increased investments after NAFTA is passed are expected to boost that figure by \$200 million to \$300 million a year, for San Diego alone.

The San Diego business community is overwhelmingly supportive of the agreement. A broad cross section of businesses which generate the majority of all jobs in the region has concluded that NAFTA will mean a net increase of jobs nationally and is crucial to the future economic health of the San Diego region.

Among those who informed me of their support of the agreement were Simon Wong, president of the Asian Business Association; Gilbert Partida, president of the Greater San Diego Chamber of Commerce; Robert Lichter, chairman of the CEO Roundtable; Mayor Susan Golding, and Gerri Warren, head of the San Diego County Black Chamber of Commerce.

These business leaders realize that NAFTA will allow San Diego firms to provide linkages and connections for increased trade, investment, services, goods, education and information. It also will open up the Mexican market to San Diego's most competitive industries, including electronics, medical equipment, computer software, telecommunications equipment and our service sector.

NAFTA opponents' chief arguments are based upon scare tactics and fear. If one believed their rhetoric, the day after NAFTA passed, employers and businesses nationwide would spontaneously decide to flee American soil and relocate south of the border in Mexico. Opponents also say that passage of NAFTA will reduce wages of U.S. workers who will be forced to compete with Mexican wage earners who earn significantly less.

These contentions are not supported by the body of economic evidence, or by decisions most businesses and employers have made, and will continue to make, in the future.

Dire predictions about the giant "sucking sound" of jobs being lost as San Diego companies flee to Mexico are unfounded. What do businessmen and women know that the anti-NAFTA forces do not?

The cheap labor alone is not sufficient enough to bring economic success. If it were, the Dominican Republic would be an economic powerhouse. It is not. No matter how cheap labor is, the bottom line to business is that the work force must have a level of education equal to or greater than the task at hand. U.S. workers are nearly five times more productive than their Mexican counterparts—this more than offsets the lure of cheap labor and provides businesses with a compelling case to remain in San Diego.

Mexico also lacks the superior infrastructure which San Diego provides. Our road and water systems far outdistance those in Mexico. As they have in the past, businesses will continue to think twice about moving production to a country with an antiquated infrastructure.

There are companies which have chosen to relocate to Mexico, taking with them Amer-

ican jobs. However, these jobs were lost primarily because we do not have a free trade agreement with Mexico. Current Mexican trade barriers put U.S. employers and businesses at a competitive disadvantage in Mexico. Businesses must pay a 20 percent tariff on their American-made exports.

With a free trade agreement, San Diego businesses will not have to pay these high tariffs and will not be compelled to move their companies to Mexico in order to compete in the market. Without NAFTA, U.S. companies have an incentive to move to Mexico if they want access to the Mexican market.

New and virtually untapped markets like Mexico are, after all, where profits for business lie. When businesses can expand and grow to meet the increased demand of larger markets, jobs are created. Every \$1 billion in exports supports 20,000 high-wage jobs. In a nutshell, exports equal jobs, NAFTA equals more exports from San Diego, therefore, NAFTA means high-skill, high-wage jobs for San Diegans.

NAFTA is key to San Diego's vision of the future. Because of the city's unique resources and position, it will become a gateway to emerging international markets—Mexico, Latin America and the Pacific Rim. If we have the vision to embrace the opportunity of international free trade, to allow our civic Cinderella to truly step out onto the ballroom floor, we must marry her to an economic winner: NAFTA.

ORTIZ COMMENDS DUSTY KNOBLAUCH, DEVOTED ADVOCATE OF ROBSTOWN RETIRES AS ADVERTISING MANAGER OF RECORD-STAR

HON. SOLOMON P. ORTIZ

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 9, 1993

Mr. ORTIZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute and commend one of the all-time great ladies of Texas, Mrs. Dusty Knoblauch. Dusty has served as the advertising manager of my hometown newspaper. When I first worked there, the paper was called the Robstown Record. That's what it was called when Dusty began working at the paper as a typesetter back in the 1960's.

Today, as she retires from journalism, our hometown paper is called the Nueces County Record-Star—and Dusty has been the advertising manager there since 1975. Prior to that she only worked part time. When she became advertising manager, however, she finally joined the staff full time, I actually came to know Dusty as a friend after I left the newspaper for the Army. She was very active in some of my early campaigns for public office.

Dusty has been one of the strongest, most articulate supporters Robstown has ever known. She has an undying passion for our hometown—and any fool who has the nerve to speak ill of Robstown is quickly ripped to shreds, for Dusty has a red-hot temper, which some people say matches her hair. She is roughly the equivalent of our hometown head cheerleader.

I have always been so very impressed with her work on civic and community projects. Her talents for advocacy made her a natural for

special projects in conjunction with the chamber of commerce. During my tenure as a public servant, I have always tried to set an example for other people—telling them that if I can make it, anybody can. Dusty has been my most consistent conveyor of that message. Dusty has been almost as big an advocate for me, as she has been for Robstown.

Mr. Speaker and colleagues, I ask that you join me today in commending Dusty Knoblauch for her years of service to our community. Thanks, Dusty.

THE CLINTON HEALTH PLAN: A RECIPE FOR RATIONING

HON. PHILIP M. CRANE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 9, 1993

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, under President Clinton's health care reform package, a National Health Board would establish and enforce an annual limit on how much money our country could spend on health care. At the same time, the President's plan guarantees a standard health benefits package to every American. As a result of this added demand for services combined with fiscal constraints, I believe that providers will be forced to ration health care to meet the Government imposed spending limit. Indeed, an editorial from the October 29, 1993, issue of the Wall Street Journal gives us an idea of what health care in the United States might become if we allow the Government to control our health care system as President Clinton has recommended. I urge my colleagues to read this alarming editorial and to support health reform alternatives which propose private sector solutions to control costs and expand coverage.

[From the Wall Street Journal, Oct. 29, 1993]

YOU BET YOUR LIFE

As the Clinton health plan unfolds, we should all be on the lookout for lessons from other countries with a long history of having governments rather than markets run a health system. One that caught our eye recently on the Reuter news wire came out of the Netherlands.

The Dutch socialized health-care system is so deep in red ink that the Netherlands Ministry of Health is financing a TV game show in which a studio audience votes on which of two real-life patients receives life-saving medical care. The TV show is called "A Matter of Life and Death." Lest anyone think we're making this up, here is the text of the full Reuter dispatch, with headline.

"DUTCH TV GAME SHOW IS A MATTER OF LIFE AND DEATH"

“(By Andrew Kelly)”

"AMSTERDAM, Netherlands.—Imagine a television game show in which a studio audience must decide which of two patients should receive life-saving medical treatment.

"Too controversial to screen? Not in the Netherlands where a series called "A Matter of Life and Death" has been confronting viewers with exactly this type of dilemma. Originally intended to stimulate debate on how to control health spending, the series has triggered criticism of its unorthodox approach to the issue.

"This is a revolting program *** improper and almost immoral," said Fons Dekkers of the Dutch patients' federation.

"In one recent episode the studio audience had to choose between two cancer patients who both wanted treatment with an expensive new drug which could prolong their lives.

"Viewers were reminded several times that doctors make the real decisions about the patients who volunteer to take part.

"But that has not dampened criticism of the series, which was partially financed by the Ministry of Health.

"You shouldn't treat such serious matters in a caricature manner," said Theo Berkestijn of the Dutch medical association.

"Critics say the series has done more harm than good by misrepresenting the complex issue of how best to allocate finite health care resources as a simple choice between two patients."

We can see where the ethic of the Roman Colosseum might offend some sensibilities. But it also strikes us as one of the great conceits of the intellectual and caring classes that only they can figure out all the complex decisions and equations that inevitably flow from their instinct to somehow control the economics of a good such as medicine. The fact is that whatever considerations may go into choosing care for one cancer patient over another under conditions of "finite resources," we suspect that the average studio TV audience would bring as much common sense to picking the winners as any team of doctors or government-paid bureaucrats.

TRIBUTE TO MICHAEL ROTONDO, EAGLE SCOUT

HON. JACK REED

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 9, 1993

Mr. REED. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to salute a distinguished young man from Rhode Island who has attained the rank of Eagle Scout in the Boy Scouts of America. He is Michael Rotondo of Troop 22 in Johnston and he is honored this week for his noteworthy achievement.

Not every young American who joins the Boy Scouts earns the prestigious Eagle Scout Award. In fact, only 2.5 percent of all Boy Scouts do. To earn the award, a Boy Scout must fulfill requirements in the areas of leadership, service, and outdoor skills. He must earn 21 merit badges, 11 of which are required from areas such as citizenship in the community, citizenship in the Nation, citizenship in the world, safety, environmental science, and first aid.

As he progresses through the Boy Scout ranks, a Scout must demonstrate participation in increasingly more responsible service projects. He must also demonstrate leadership skills by holding one or more specific youth leadership positions in his patrol and/or troop.

These young men have distinguished themselves in accordance with these criteria.

For his Eagle Scout project, Michael cleaned out a cemetery in Cranston that had been allowed to become overgrown and where tombstones were not even visible due to excessive overgrowth.

Mr. Speaker, I ask you and my colleagues to join me in saluting Eagle Scout Michael Rotondo. In turn, we must duly recognize the Boy Scouts of America for establishing the Eagle Scout Award and the strenuous criteria its aspirants must meet. This program has through its 80 years honed and enhanced the leadership skills and commitment to public service of many outstanding Americans, 2 dozen of whom now serve in the House.

It is my sincere belief that Michael Rotondo will continue his public service and in so doing will further distinguish himself and consequently better his community. I join friends, colleagues, and family who this week salute him.

U.N. PEACEKEEPING

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 9, 1993

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, there has been a great deal of confusion surrounding U.N. peacekeeping operations and the role of the United States in such operations. I am therefore inserting in the RECORD material provided to me by the executive branch which I hope will help to improve the accuracy of information in current policy discussions.

The first set of documents provide a schedule of peacekeeping renewal mandates. Only two U.N. peacekeeping operations have indefinite mandates. The others have mandates of fixed duration which the Security Council must periodically renew. Included is a list of the renewal dates for all U.N. peacekeeping operations, both by calendar month and by operation. In this way Congress can remain informed as to when Security Council votes to extend peacekeeping mandates are expected.

The second document is financial. I must note that even though the United States is at this moment current on its peacekeeping assessments, this was achieved only by using fiscal year 1994 appropriations to pay calendar year 1993 assessments. There is only \$8 million in fiscal year 1994 funds remaining to pay 1994 peacekeeping assessments, of which the U.S. share may reach \$1 billion. Congress and the executive branch will have to address this shortfall in the months ahead.

I will submit additional material for the RECORD on peacekeeping issues in the coming days, in an effort to keep my colleagues informed on this important issue.

RENEWAL DATES FOR U.N. PEACEKEEPING MANDATES

(PREPARED BY HFAC STAFF)

Background

Only two of the oldest UN peacekeeping operations have indefinite mandates: UNGOMIP (India/Pakistan), and UNTSO (Middle East).

The remaining peacekeeping operations have mandates of fixed duration which the Security Council must periodically extend. Most are set at six months, but others vary.

Occasionally, mandates are extended for only a day or two in order to give the Security Council time to address new questions before a longer mandate is approved.

The following list indicates when mandates are due to be extended by calendar month.

The Administration is now asking that when the Security Council extends mandates, a review is specified mid-way through the mandate term to force the Council to assess any new developments.

SECURITY COUNCIL RENEWAL DATES FOR PEACEKEEPING FORCES

(BY MONTH)

October 1993: ONUMOZ (Mozambique) expired October 31, extended until November 5; UNOSOM II (Somalia) expired October 31, extended until November 18.

November 1993: UNAVEM II (Angola) review due by November 1; UNFICYP (Cyprus) review due by November 15; UNTAC (Cambodia) will permanently end November 15; limited extensions until November 31/December 31 for mine-clearance and military police/medical personnel; ONUSAL (El Salvador) expires November 30; MINURSO (W. Sahara) expires November 30; UNDOF (Golan Heights) expires November 30.

December 1993: UNPROFOR (Yugoslavia) review due by December 4; UNMIH (Haiti) review due by December 7; UNAVEM II (Angola) expires December 15; UNFICYP (Cyprus) expires December 15; UNOMIL (Liberia) review due by December 16.

January 1994: UNOMUR (Rwanda) review due by January 5; UNIFIL (Lebanon) expires January 31; UNOMIG (Georgia) expires January 31.

February 1994: ONUMOZ (Mozambique) review due by February 5; UNOMIL (Liberia) review due by February 16.

March 1994: UNMIH (Haiti) expires March 23.

April 1994: UNPROFOR (Yugoslavia) expires April 4; UNIKOM (Iraq/Kuwait) expires April 9; UNOMUR (Rwanda) expires April 5; UNOMIL (Liberia) expires April 22.

May 1994: ONUMOZ (Mozambique) expires May 5; UNFICYP (Cyprus) expires May 15; UNDOF (Golan Heights) expires May 30.

June 1994:

July 1994: UNIFIL (Lebanon) expires July 31.

NOTE: Above assumes in some cases that mandates continue to be extended for same time periods as before. Also, some dates could vary if short, temporary extensions are made.

ACTION DATES FOR UN PEACEKEEPING AND OBSERVER MISSIONS AND KEY SANCTIONS RESOLUTIONS

Country	Authorizing resolution	Resolution expiration date	Next SYG report expected	Comments
Libya:				
Sanctions	#748 of 3/31/92	n/a	120 days, next: 12/13/93	Resolution tightening sanctions under consideration 11/5/93.
Haiti:				
UNMIH	#867 of 9/23/93	3/23/94	o/a 12/6/93	Deployment delayed due to Haitian military refusal to respect accords.
Sanctions and enforcement	#873 of 10/13/93	n/a	n/a	Sanctions part of international efforts to compel military to implement accords.
	#875 of 10/16/93			
Somalia:				
UNOSOM II	#878 of 10/29/93	11/18/93	11/15/93	Resolution to extend 6 mos. under review 11/2/93.

ACTION DATES FOR UN PEACEKEEPING AND OBSERVER MISSIONS AND KEY SANCTIONS RESOLUTIONS—Continued

Country	Authorizing resolution	Resolution expiration date	Next SYG report expected	Comments
Iraq:				
UNSCOM	#687 and others	n/a	11/18/93	UNSC review each 60 days; UNSC action needed to lift sanctions.
UNIKOM	#687 and others, #806 2/5/93 (no exp)	n/a	6 mo. SC review; next: 4/94	UNSC action needed to terminate UNIKOM.
El Salvador:				
ONUSAL	#832 of 5/27/93	11/30/93	o/a 11/30/93	Renewal or extension is subject to SYG report and UNSC decision.
Israel/Syria:				
UNDOF	#830 of 5/26/93	11/30/93	prior to 11/30/93	
Angola:				
UNAVEM	#864 of 9/15/93	12/15/93	o/a 12/10/93	UNAVEM only partially deployed due to conflict; as of 11/2/93 ceasefire talks underway.
Cyprus:				
UNFICYP	#831 of 5/27/93	12/15/93	o/a 12/10/93	UNFICYP is largely funded by Cyprus & Greece.
Western Sahara:				
MINURSO	#809 of 3/2/93	n/a	mid-November	Funds run out in 1994.
Georgia:				
UNOMIG	#881 of 11/4/93	1/31/94	Before 1/31/94	
Lebanon:				
UNIFIL	#852 of 7/28/93	1/31/94	prior to 1/31/94	
Liberia:				
UNOMIL	#866 of 9/22/93	2/16/94	12/16/93 and 2/16/94	
Former Yugoslavia:				
UNPROFOR	#871 of 10/4/93	4/1/94	12/4/93	
Rwanda:				
UNAMIR	#872 of 10/5/93	4/5/94	1/5/94	Continues beyond 1/5/94 only upon UNSC review of the SYG report.
Mozambique:				
ONUMOZ	#877 of 11/5/93	5/5/93	o/a 2/5/94	Vote scheduled 11/5/93.
Cambodia:				
UNTAC	#880 of 11/4/93	n/a (UNTAC departs before 12/31/93)	"lessons learned" requested by UNSC	20 observers will remain until 5/4/94, mission was under consideration 11/2.
India/Pakistan:				
UNMOGIP	#201 of 9/6/65 (no expiration)		none scheduled	Funded from the UN general budget.
Jerusalem:				
UNTSO	#50 of 5/29/48 (no expiration)		none scheduled	Funded from the UN general budget.
South Africa:				
UNOMSA	#772 of 8/17/92 (no expiration)		quarterly next: 12/93	

U.S. Contributions for international peacekeeping—(million of dollars)		Fiscal year 1994 (est)		Fiscal year 1994 (est)	
UN force					
UNDOF: Golan Heights	11.6	MINURSO: Western Sahara	12.8	UNFICYP: Cyprus	—
UNIFIL: Lebanon	46.7	ONUSAL: El Salvador	10.9	UNMIH: Haiti	27.3
UNIKOM: Iraq/Kuwait	7.5	UNTAC: Cambodia	54.9	UNOMIG: Georgia	9.4
UNAVEM: Angola	29.7	UNPROFOR: Former Yugoslavia	281.0	UNAMIR: Rwanda Expanded	38
		UNOSOM: Somalia	301.6	UNOMILS: Liberia	17.1
		UNOMOZ: Mozambique	72.9		
		UNOMUR: Rwanda	4.0	Total Estimated Assmts	925.4

CONTRIBUTIONS FOR INTERNATIONAL PEACEKEEPING ACTIVITIES* FUND USE—1993 ACTUAL/1994 PROPOSED

(Thousands of dollars)

	1993 amounts paid	1993 assmts unpaid	1994 Funds—additional		
			Already paid	Proposed to pay	Total**
UNDOF: Golan Hts	10,787				0
UNIFIL: Lebanon	38,342				0
UNIKOM: Iraq/Kuwait	13,701				0
ONUSAL: El Sivr	8,544				0
UNTAC: Cambodia	240,963				0
UNPROFOR: Fmr Yugo	70,051	176,203	159,254	16,949	176,203
UNOMOZ: Mozambique	13,277	45,724		45,724	45,724
UNAVEM II: Angola	1,791	8,872		8,872	8,872
UNOSOM II: Somalia	40,917	141,300	141,300		141,300
Subtotal	438,323	372,099	300,554	71,545	372,099
Arrears	21,992	0	20,892	0	20,892
Total	460,315	372,099	321,446	71,545	392,991
1994 remain**					8,616
1994 Total appropriation					401,607

* Assessments recalculated at 30.387 percent.

** With total allocated of \$392,990,532 leaves \$8,616,468 available for all other requirements.

THE NEED FOR AN ADDITIONAL AIRCRAFT CARRIER

HON. ROBERT G. TORRICELLI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 9, 1993

Mr. TORRICELLI. Mr. Speaker, I rise to address one of the central questions affecting fu-

ture U.S. defense planning in this age of declining defense expenditures—whether to fund construction of an additional aircraft carrier.

The turmoil surrounding the breakup of the Soviet Union has increased the importance of being able to deploy a determining amount of firepower to far-off crises. The American aircraft carrier is uniquely suited for this mission. Indeed, both the President and the Congress

agree that another carrier is needed. We should fund it now.

Some want to ignore the dangers we face. They say the Soviet Union is gone and there are no more serious threats to our Nation's security. They say we are the sole remaining superpower—this is true. However, that does not mean that there are no nations that could directly challenge the interests of the United

States. No one thought Saddam Hussein would be crazy enough to invade Kuwait and threaten the oil supply of the West—but it happened. And, it took more than 500,000 American soldiers, sailors, and airmen and tens of billions of dollars to restore peace to the Middle East. Tens of thousands of lives were lost, the environment was severely damaged and some of America's young men and women had to die to defeat Saddam Hussein's Army.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that a lean but strong U.S. military is the best means of preserving the peace. We now need to ensure that our military forces are well equipped to meet the emerging dangers we will face in the 21st century at the most cost-efficient price.

The most likely threats will arise in the regional states most hostile to the United States and the interest of democracy and freedom. However, as we close more military bases in Europe, the Philippines, and throughout the world, America's capability to respond quickly to crises diminishes.

Iraq, Iran, Syria, and North Korea are but a few examples of rogue states that have expressed open hostility to the United States, and to Israel, our key democratic ally in the Middle East.

Mr. Speaker, in each of these cases, aircraft carriers would be a critical element in crisis management or, if hostilities broke out, a critical element in a military response. I would like to quote briefly from the executive summary of an excellent study authored by Dr. Jacqueline K. Davis:

Because the aircraft carrier platform is large enough to integrate a mix of Marine, Army and Air Force assets with its own considerable striking power, it will be central to U.S. joint planning in the future—both for peacetime forward presence missions and wartime operations. By virtue of its geography, the United States is a maritime nation whose welfare and global role depends on unimpeded access to the world's sea lines of communication (SLOCs). Although there may be comparatively little direct threat to U.S. navigation on the open seas (now that the Soviet Union has imploded), the potential for conflict in key regional theaters is very real—conflicts that could escalate into open warfare either involving the engagement of U.S. forces, or posing a threat to U.S. (and allied) commercial and strategic interests, or both. With the proliferation of weapons technologies and the growing lethality of the forces of potential regional adversaries, the capability of the aircraft carrier battle group will provide to a joint commander or theater CINC an important enabling force to facilitate crisis response, sustained military operations, conflict escalation and war termination.

Mr. Speaker, President Clinton already discovered the value of aircraft carriers in fulfilling his duties as Commander-in-Chief. He sent carriers to Somalia, Iran, Iraq, Bosnia and even Haiti. He said on March 12 of this year:

When word of a crisis breaks out in Washington, it's no accident that the first question that comes to everyone's lips is: "Where is the nearest carrier?"

We in Congress are now faced with the issue of whether to fund a new aircraft carrier in this year's defense budget.

The question boils down not to whether we should fund the carrier, but when. This year or next year?

If this is the question—and I think it is the pertinent question—then my answer is we should fund it this year.

The Congress already decided to build the carrier last year. As a down payment, \$832 million was authorized and appropriated by both houses. Now, we are really just debating the structure of the payment plan.

The House and Senate Appropriations Committees recommended that funding the carrier this year would be more cost-effective than re-opening the construction line next year. Both committees stated that moving ahead this year will reduce the cost of the carrier by at least \$200 million. The Senate version also provides that none of the funds appropriated be obligated or expended until authorized by law.

In addition, the Clinton administration concluded in its Bottom-Up Review that a replacement carrier is needed to maintain a 12 carrier fleet and to help preserve the U.S. shipbuilding industry.

Mr. Speaker, my constituents want me to vote for common sense and against waste. I cannot see any reason to wait a year, when waiting will waste \$200 million of the taxpayers' money. We should fund the additional carrier now.

THE BROOKS ACT, UNDER ATTACK AGAIN

HON. JACK BROOKS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 9, 1993

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, the Brooks Act is under attack, again. Some of the names and some of the titles have changed, but the complaints are the same as we have heard periodically for the past 28 years: burdensome, causes delays, costs too much. But when I hear these complaints and calls for repeal or gutting of the Brooks Act, I think of an inscription found in one of John F. Kennedy's notebooks, "Don't ever take down a fence, until you know the reason why it was put up." The Brooks Act for many years has served the taxpayers well as a fence against waste and abuse in Federal procurement. According to executive branch figures, it has saved the Government over \$21.7 billion since its enactment in 1965 and \$1.6 billion in fiscal year 1992 alone.

The Brooks Act, which I sponsored, gives the General Services Administration [GSA] authority to manage and oversee Federal acquisition of computers and telecommunications equipment and services, so-called ADPE. At his discretion the GSA Administrator may delegate purchasing authority for ADPE to individual agencies. However, while the Act permits the Administrator to use his judgment regarding delegation, that does not mean the Administrator should abolish GSA's central role in the process by delegating most or all of GSA's authority. Such a move would be considered an abdication by GSA and would effectively eviscerate the Brooks Act.

Centralization of ADPE purchases achieves tremendous savings through economies of scale as a result of consolidated purchases. Further, it enhances the Government's ability

to move computerized data and programs between agencies and promotes sharing and compatibility across the Government. When agencies are left to their own accord, the result is too often waste, fraud, and abuse. For example, a rash of disastrous ADPE procurements in recent years has demonstrated the critical necessity for the planning requirements, oversight, and practical remedies contained in the Brooks Act and its implementing regulations. The following are just a few examples.

In a review of major Navy ADPE procurements in 1990, the Government Operations Committee found an appalling lack of competition in Federal ADPE procurement. Unnecessary compatibility restrictions, wired specifications, agency nonfeasance or misfeasance, and questionable tactics by the industry's dominant vendor had resulted in the majority of Federal mainframe computer procurements being awarded without competition or with woefully inadequate competition.

In 1991, the General Accounting Office investigated an \$806 million computer procurement by the National Institutes of Health. GAO found that this procurement, known as DCRT, was conducted virtually without agency oversight. The new computer system was rarely used for scientific computing projects, even though it was justified on the basis of an alleged need by NIH scientists for such a system. GAO also found that NIH officials planned the procurement so poorly that competition was severely restricted, resulting in only one company bidding on the huge contract.

In 1992, GAO found that the Air Force's Standard Systems Command [SSC] had demonstrated a pattern of mismanagement that resulted in the purchase of millions of dollars in unneeded ADPE equipment and services. The Air Force could not control a nearly \$1 billion ADPE contract because it had no effective means to account for orders, deliveries, and payments. In addition, the Air Force inappropriately limited competition by ordering equipment and services that were not within the scope of the contract and should have been subject to open competition. GAO found that the Air Force wasted millions of dollars by purchasing equipment that was not justified by valid user requirements or convincing cost-benefit analysis.

These examples are just a few of the hundreds of calamity-ridden ADPE procurements conducted by Federal agencies over the past few years. The Brooks Act is the Government's best defense against such squandering of the taxpayers' money. Repealing or gutting the Brooks Act now would be like abolishing the police department in response to a crime-wave.

It is indisputable that there are long delays in some ADPE procurements. The contention that the Brooks Act plays a major role in those delays, however, is based largely on unsupported anecdotes. Much, if not all, of the delays in ADPE procurements can be traced to burdensome agency redtape, failure to conduct adequate planning and to define requirements, and failure to follow Federal procurement laws and regulations, resulting in protests.

Complaints by agency procurement officials about the Brooks Act are like the traditional

complaints by soldiers about messhall food—the anecdotes, once told and retold, take on a life of their own, not necessarily hampered by attention to the facts. There has been, however, an objective, professional study of this issue. A few years ago, the General Accounting office studied DOD's use of the so-called Warner amendment, which—unadvisedly in my view—exempts from the Brooks Act DOD's procurement of certain types of ADPE equipment and services. GAO compared the timeliness of DOD procurements under the Warner amendment to the timeliness of DOD procurements subject to the Brooks Act. GAO found as follows:

In the 22 selected examples we reviewed, we found that there is little difference between the Warner Amendment and the Brooks Act procurements in the acquisition procedures followed and the total time needed to complete procurements. Defense could not provide studies or other support for claims of shorter acquisition time for Warner Amendment procurements.

It is clear that when we look beyond the anecdotes, claims of long delays caused by the Brooks Act do not stand up under rigorous, unbiased scrutiny.

A common lightning rod for complaints about the Brooks Act are the requirements in the Federal information resources management regulation [FIRMR], the Brooks Act's implementing regulations, that a Federal agency conduct a requirements analysis and an alternatives analysis before proceeding with an ADPE acquisition. But the critics seldom explain how the taxpayers would benefit if Federal agencies were able to conduct multimillion-dollar computer and telecommunications procurements without verifying their requirements or checking alternatives. Further the complex, burdensome analyses that critics complain of are not required by the FIRMR. All the FIRMR requires is that these analyses be done commensurate with the size and complexity of the need. For small, commercial item acquisitions, this could be as simple as a brief memo or even a notation on an order form. If, as some critics say, agencies are overinterpreting these requirements, the solution is a change in agency practices, not evisceration of the Brooks Act or the FIRMR.

But perhaps the feature of the Brooks Act that draws the most cannon fire is the protest authority granted the General Services Board of Contract Appeals [GSBCA]. In my view, however, the protest authority is the crown jewel of the Brooks Act. It is a bedrock principle of economics that an increase in competition among sellers is beneficial to prospective buyers. In Federal ADPE procurement, the Brooks Act protest process has helped ensure rigorous—some would say cutthroat—competition for Federal contracts. The beneficiaries of this competition have been Federal agencies and the taxpayers.

Fortunately, we do not need to depend on foggy anecdotes to demonstrate these benefits. In 1991, the Brooks Act protest system was subject to a rigorous, nonpartisan, economic, and legal analysis by professors of economics at Duke University and the University of Pittsburgh. Professor Robert Marshall and his colleagues studied the Brooks Act protest process in detail, and found that "protests are an effective means of deterring and correcting

agency problems among procurement personnel and, consequently, accomplishing the procurement objectives of the government." The three professors concluded:

The protest process at the GSBCA has had a significant impact on [ADPE] procurements over the past eight years. The Request for Proposals (hereinafter "RFPs") and Invitation for Bids (hereinafter "IFBs") that are issued now for federal [ADPE] procurements are far less restrictive than they were years ago, permitting larger numbers of firms to participate. Questionable practices of procurement officials [POs], such as favoring particular vendors or biasing product evaluation towards excessively high technology items, have been deterred and corrected by the GSBCA protest process. In addition, GSBCA protests have provided the makers of new or unique products, whose exclusion from federal [ADPE] procurements was often a fait accompli, a means to gain access into the federal ADPE market.

In addition to the beneficial economic effects the presence of GSBCA has on competition in the Federal ADPE market, some protests result in immediate, quantifiable, cash savings to the Government. For example, in the recent Desktop IV computer procurement, the Air Force attempted to award one of the largest ADPE contracts ever with no discussions with the vendors, 6 weeks after receipt of proposals. Agency mistakes resulted in three separate protests—just the sort of situation cited as a problem by critics of the Brooks Act. But the fact is that by the time the smoke had cleared, the final price paid by the Government was half a billion dollars less than the price offered by the original contract awardee. That half a billion dollars saved on a single procurement probably exceeds the entire cost of implementation of the Brooks Act for many years.

In another example, the FAA was forced by a protest to readmit to a competition a vendor that had been improperly excluded. That competitor ultimately won the reopened competition at a price \$13 million less than the original contract awardee.

In yet another example, the Department of Agriculture was forced by a protest to readmit two vendors that had been excluded improperly from a competition. These vendors' offers were \$10 million and \$40 million less than the original contract awardee's offer.

The attack on the Brooks Act is bound up in the recent campaign to reform Federal procurement so that the Government buys goods and services like a commercial firm buys goods and services. But there is a tendency among critics of the Brooks Act and other procurement laws to be too slippery with the words they use to talk about this, confusing "buying commercial products" with following "commercial buying practices."

Practically everyone involved in Federal procurement agrees that the Government should buy off-the-shelf, commercial products whenever possible, instead of having things built from scratch to special Government specifications. Nobody wants the Government to be paying \$50 for a screwdriver and \$500 for a coffeepot. But adopting commercial buying practices, that is, buying goods and services the same way commercial firms buy goods and services, is an entirely different matter. Such a change would require a radical, ill-advised transformation in Federal procurement.

The simple fact is that the Government is not a commercial firm and has different motivations, interests, and goals than commercial firms. The Government answers to the voters; commercial firms answer to the stockholders. The Government is concerned with the welfare of all Americans; commercial firms are concerned chiefly with profit. The Government must treat all potential sellers, that is, its citizens, fairly; commercial firms need only be concerned with efficiency. The Government has an interest in protecting all segments of our society, including small businesses, minorities, women, and the handicapped; commercial firms have an interest in the bottom line.

Mr. Speaker, I agree with critics of the Brooks Act that we need faster and more timely ADPE procurements. But ADPE procurements will not be made faster and more timely by abandoning careful preacquisition planning. I agree that we need an efficient Federal procurement system. But we cannot permit that efficiency to be achieved by permitting the Federal Treasury to be raided through waste, fraud, and abuse. I agree that procurement regulations and procedures should be made simpler, both for ADPE and non-ADPE procurements. The executive branch needs to devise improved oversight of agency procedures and provide increased training of program and procurement personnel in order to achieve greater simplicity and improved procurements. But the price of simplicity and improvement of procurement actions cannot be a procurement system in which the same large corporations win Federal contracts with tiresome predictability.

Mr. Speaker, the Brooks Act works. It has saved the taxpayers billions of dollars and has resulted in a vibrant Federal ADPE market. It should be left alone.

THE ENTITLEMENTS SPENDING SPIRAL: RHETORIC VERSUS ACTION

HON. DAN SCHAEFER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 9, 1993

Mr. SCHAEFER. Mr. Speaker, when Congress narrowly passed the President's tax package late in the summer, Capitol Hill optimists hoped the Federal budget deficit crisis would ebb for awhile. Unfortunately, deficit figures now indicate that, despite the largest tax increase in history, the deficit continues to plague Congress' every move. After briefly dipping to only \$200 billion in 1996, the deficit will soon climb back to its current level and then explode off the charts after the turn of the century.

Eliminating waste and fraud in a \$1.5 trillion budget—everybody's favorite solution to reducing the deficit—will not alone cut it. In fact, Congress could slash all discretionary spending in half—including programs like defense, education, housing, and law enforcement—yet still not eliminate the deficit.

The dirty little secret of budget politics is entitlement spending. Congress has set welfare, health care, retirement security, agricultural

price supports, student loans, and many other programs on budgetary autopilot by declaring such spending as mandatory. Unlike discretionary programs, Congress does not examine and approve such mandatory spending on an annual basis. At best, such programs are reviewed and reauthorized every few years—if ever.

Next year alone, Congress will spend \$808 billion on mandatory spending, over half of the budget, without casting a single vote. Clearly, true and lasting deficit reduction will never take place until Congress honestly deals with the politically touchy subject of entitlements.

Many of us in Washington have long recognized this fact. Others, like President Clinton, are just beginning to acknowledge the problem. Last week, the President established a Bipartisan Commission on Entitlement Reform to recommend savings in entitlement programs. Senator BOB KERREY, who cast the critical deciding vote for the President's tax bill and has pushed for the Commission, will be its chairman.

President Clinton has grabbed some headlines without solving any problems. His Commission will hold some hearings and formulate a "wish list" of cuts, but nothing in the President's Executive order can force Congress to act on these recommendations.

In the end, the Commission's report will likely end up gathering cobwebs in the same Government warehouse as has the extraordinary report on Government waste written by the Grace Commission in 1984. Like the Grace Commission, the President's Entitlement Commission will lack the power to force congressional consideration of its recommendations and, therefore, will have a correspondingly little chance of fostering substantive change.

Don't get me wrong. The idea of a Commission tasked to proposed entitlement savings is itself a fine idea. Congress has certainly proven itself incapable of even engaging in an honest debate on the subject. But to be truly effective, such a Commission needs to be modeled after a more successful model—the Base Closure and Realignment Commission. This panel, statutorily established in 1988, has had remarkable success in closing military installations—nearly 400 to date—in the districts of even the most politically powerful Members of Congress.

The Base Closure Commission has been effective because not only does it make difficult recommendations, but Congress is required to consider an unamendable proposal, subject to a single "yes" or "no" vote. In effect, this little independent, nonpartisan Commission gave Congress a much-needed backbone transplant by forcing it to make the tough choices it would have otherwise ducked.

There are striking parallels between Congress' past inability to close military bases and its current inability to cut mandatory spending. That is why I have introduced legislation creating a Mandatory Spending Control Commission that builds on the success of the Base Closure Commission.

My legislation would establish an independent, nine-member Commission of private citizens to examine mandatory spending. The President, in consultation with Congress, would appoint commissioners to serve single

3-year terms. Each year, the Commission would review the myriad of mandatory spending programs and present to the President and Congress a proposal to limit the annual growth of these programs to 3 percent. Since, on average, mandatory spending programs have grown over 12 percent annually since 1965, limiting the growth to 3 percent is a tall order, but a pressing one if we are to get a handle on the deficit.

Once the Commission submits its recommendations to Congress, my bill would require Congress to consider the legislation quickly and vote on the proposal. Congressional committees would have the opportunity to review and amend my Commission's recommendations, but the final bill would have to maintain the level of savings achieved by the Commission—without substituting cuts with new taxes. The House and Senate would then have one "yes" or "no" vote on the entire proposal. No floor amendments. No partisan parliamentary tricks. No hiding.

Unlike the President's Commission, my bill requires Congress to continually address its spending addiction. The President's Commission is just one feeble shot at a problem that demands constant attention. My Commission would continue to submit recommendations to Congress until a balanced budget is achieved 2 years in a row, thus keeping Congress' feet to the fire. Further, my bill would ensure that Congress cannot simply turn around and spend the Commission's savings on other programs.

More importantly, my bill would eliminate the budget deficit simply by controlling the growth of mandatory spending. If Congress passed my Commission's recommendations each year beginning in 1995, the budget would be balanced by 2001, assuming discretionary spending is not increased. By the year 2002, the United States would actually have a \$32.2 billion budget surplus under my bill, as opposed to the \$320 billion budget deficit currently projected.

President Clinton's panel may focus attention on the issue of mandatory spending, but will not force Congress to do anything. My bill requires Congress to consider a proposal to cut mandatory spending, vote on it, and demonstrate to the American people its budgetary fortitude. My legislation would help our Nation take significant strides toward a rational budgetary policy. Make no mistake, the President's Commission will create only a few headlines. The Mandatory Spending Control Commission will force Congress to take action.

THE NAFTA DEBATE

HON. RON PACKARD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 9, 1993

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Speaker, passage of NAFTA will begin the creation of the largest free-trade zone in the world—over 370 million people.

Tonight Vice President GORE will debate NAFTA's chief critic, Ross Perot. Hopefully, in this neutral forum, the obvious, long-term benefits of NAFTA will shine.

Mr. Perot has made opposition to the North American Free-Trade Agreement the platform for his political aspirations. Unfortunately, instead of entertaining and articulating some of the valid concerns Americans have about NAFTA, his platform is built upon exaggerations and hollow soundbites. In his attempt to undermine public support for this agreement, Mr. Perot has ironically aligned himself with the entrenched status quo.

It was Mr. Perot's plain-spoken, common-sense attacks on the wastefulness and largess of official Washington which brought him to national prominence during the 1992 Presidential election cycle. He rode a wave of voter anger about business-as-usual in our Nation's Capital. Why then, if Mr. Perot was the champion of reform, did he choose to embrace the status quo and stir up public opposition to NAFTA that is not even based upon facts?

NAFTA is one of the most progressive, reform-minded votes Congress can make this session. It will open up a vast and largely untapped market of 90 million Mexican citizens, eager to buy American goods. It will tear down the old walls of protectionism that have weighed down American businesses trying to compete in the Mexican market. It will create more high-wage, high-skilled jobs. More trade is, by definition, better for America.

As America watches the debate tonight, I hope that they will weigh the facts for NAFTA against the demagoguery against it. Mr. Perot, as a businessman himself, should put his political aspirations aside, and should stick to the facts about NAFTA.

HONORING WILLIAM D. ROEBUCK

HON. RON de LUGO

OF THE VIRGIN ISLANDS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 9, 1993

Mr. DE LUGO. Mr. Speaker, the quality of life each of us is able to enjoy is largely dependent upon the economy that underpins our Nation and each community within it. A strong economy means jobs, jobs mean opportunities, and opportunities are the road to success.

The economy of my community, the U.S. Virgin Islands, is far more sound, and the quality of life that Virgin Islanders enjoy is much better, because of the excellent work of William D. Roebuck.

Bill Roebuck recently stepped down as the director of the Virgin Islands Industrial Development Commission where he provided both vision and leadership.

Bill saw to it that the Virgin Islands continued to attract light industry to our shores while making sure that the companies he attracted would contribute to the islands in meaningful ways in exchange for the benefits they received.

Attracting industry and investment to any community is an extraordinarily difficult job, particularly when its more than a thousand miles from the U.S. mainland where the costs and logistics of doing business are far more complex. But there are advantages, and Bill was an expert seeing them and promoting them.

However, there is a very fine line and balance between providing benefits and being sure that those who benefit also invest in the community around them particularly in their hiring practices.

Bill Roebuck never forgot that the actual gain to our community was not in the taxes a company contributes at the moment but in the jobs it produces and the skills that it teaches. In years to come, when a company experiences success, then is the time to exact taxes.

Bill Roebuck also was able to put in place the Virgin Islands' first light industrial park. Located in St. Croix, it was so successful that it expanded from one building to three and is being copied on St. Thomas as well.

I want to thank William Roebuck for the fine job he did as the director of industrial development and wish him as much success in the private sector as he had during his years in government.

ORTIZ COMMENDS LIVE NOW MINISTRIES—BROWNSVILLE BASED MINISTRY COULD TEACH CONGRESS ABOUT DEALING WITH POVERTY

HON. SOLOMON P. ORTIZ

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 9, 1993

Mr. ORTIZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to an organization which deals realistically with the problems of poverty and indigence among the citizens of my community of Brownsville, TX.

Live Now Ministries has worked tirelessly since June 1986 to deal with the needs of those in our community who are destitute and needy—and has focused the attention of our community on the underlying causes of poverty, and what each individual can do to bring about change. That, Mr. Speaker, and colleagues, is a tall order, and one of which I am most proud.

Live Now Ministries incorporates the mission and the spirit of the Good Samaritan, as illustrated in the Bible. In the mission's statement of purpose, they ask the penetrating question: "Who is our neighbor? Must we step over the sick, hungry, homeless, naked bodies of our immediate neighbors to reach those who are far away?" Live Now Ministries is a revolutionary idea whose time is now. We learned when we were young that if you give someone a fish, they can eat for a day—but if you teach them to fish, they can eat for a lifetime. Live Now Ministries has turned that parable into a practical application for our time.

Live Now Ministries has made dealing with the disadvantaged citizens within our borders a priority—and has done so with no funding from the Federal Government. It is an organization which is there to aid anyone with any need, no matter how big, no matter how seemingly trivial. My office receives a great many requests for help with various Government services, but as many of you know, sometimes Federal regulations prevent my office from helping them. When that is the case, we send people to Live Now Ministries.

With an invaluable network of medical, legal, business, educational, city, county, and State representatives comprising the advisory council—Live Now has found the combination to the lock which has for so long kept the problem of poverty low on our national priority list. By combining all the necessary elements of society which are in a position to help the needy, one organization has gently forced us to focus our attention on real ways to help the needy in our area.

Live Now is a single force for social change. Live Now's advisory council has instituted a two-pronged approach to deal with poverty. First, the network of Live Now Ministries has designed a framework for creating industrial enterprises such as farming, sewing, and marketing a host of goods for profit.

The ministry also understands that a lack of education is the fundamental underlying cause of poverty. So, the second tier to the ministry's approach is one dedicated to education—the teaching of carpentry, cake decorating, plumbing, sewing and office skills. The idea is to teach skills which are in demand in the community.

In 1991, Live Now instituted a highly successful pilot project which provided summer activities for the local, high-risk youth. Taking them to the beach, fishing, etc., kept them occupied and, as a result, none—none—of these young people had problems with the authorities. In fact, most showed a remarkable improvement in their attitudes and behavioral patterns.

As this Congress looks at the societal problems of poverty, hunger, and homelessness—we would do well to listen to the lessons taught by the Live Now Ministries.

TRIBUTE TO ANGELINA JULIA PALUMBO

HON. STENY H. HOYER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 9, 1993

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I extend my warmest wishes to Mrs. Angelina Julia Palumbo who will celebrate her 90th birthday on November 25, 1993.

Mrs. Palumbo truly personifies the traditional definition of the American dream. She was born in 1903 in the Italian province of Bari. At the young age of 9 she traveled by boat with her parents to begin their new lives in the United States of America. Mrs. Palumbo's first impressions of America, like many immigrants in the early 1900's, were at Ellis Island. Her family settled in Brooklyn, then moved to join the large Italian-American community in Newark, NJ.

In 1917 Mrs. Palumbo married Pasquale Palumbo, who has also immigrated from Italy as a child. Together, Mr. and Mrs. Palumbo successfully built a heating and fuel company and, more importantly, they created a strong and loving family. They raised nine children, eight boys and one girl.

Although she began her family many decades ago, Mrs. Palumbo was in many ways a modern woman. She was a mother and a

businesswoman. As the bookkeeper for their business she spent many hours working to provide a livelihood that would support her large family. The room behind her office served as a kitchen so that after many hours of work she could cook and maintain a sense of family unity often felt during meals together.

Mr. Speaker, Angelina Julia Palumbo was a businesswoman, but first and foremost she was a mother. She recognized the abundant opportunities available to her children that were not accessible to her as a young woman and that the only reliable means to success is a good education. She instilled this conviction in her children and sacrificed vacations and material possessions so that each of her 9 children could attend college.

Today her children are all successful professionals. They are doctors, lawyers, and businessmen. The importance of a good education is a belief that she has imparted not only to her children, but also to her 22 grandchildren and 9 great-grandchildren.

Mrs. Angelina Julia Palumbo is truly a remarkable woman. She successfully raised 9 children who all, in their own right, may be counted among the outstanding people of our country. For her unremitting devotion to her family and countless hours of work she has their eternal admiration and love. As Americans we are very lucky Mrs. Palumbo was brought to this country in 1912. For her many positive contributions to our country I applaud her. She truly exemplifies everything that makes the United States great.

U.N. PEACEKEEPING—PART II

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 9, 1993

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, in a continuing effort to keep my colleagues informed on matters relating to peacekeeping, I am today submitting a summary prepared by Foreign Affairs Committee staff on the process by which the Security Council approves peacekeeping operations. Although it may seem to some in Congress that the Security Council approves new operations casually and quickly, that is not in fact the case. There is a clear process, usually requiring months of preparation, before a new peacekeeping operation is brought to a vote in the Security Council. I am submitting a description of that process, as well as the chronology of the approval process for the four most recently approved peacekeeping operations.

PROCESS FOR APPROVING PEACEKEEPING MISSIONS

(Prepared by HFAC staff)

BACKGROUND

There is an unwritten but fairly standard procedure followed by the U.N. in approving peacekeeping missions.

Generally, this procedure requires months of preparations before the Security Council votes to establish a peacekeeping mission.

Because the process relies on consensus, proposals which are unlikely to be approved by the Security Council usually do not evolve beyond the exploratory stage.

Following is a generic description of the process by which peacekeeping missions are approved.

Also included are brief descriptions of the timelines on the most recent four peacekeeping missions approved.

Only three new countries have moved even part-way through this process as of now: Tajikistan, Nagorno-Karabakh, and Burundi. Other than those two, and the ongoing peacekeeping missions, the Security Council has not approved statements on any other countries.

PEACEKEEPING APPROVAL PROCESS

A country (or another interested party) requests the Security Council for assistance, either because a ceasefire is in place or is anticipated.

The Secretary General informs the Security Council that he proposes to name a Special Envoy to undertake a good offices visit to the country (sometimes this is a survey mission instead).

The Security Council approves a statement of its concurrence with this action.

The envoy/survey mission makes a visit. The Secretary General submits a report to the Security Council on the visit.

The Security Council approves a statement requesting the Secretary General to keep it apprised of developments.

The reporting process is repeated until a ceasefire or political agreement is reached.

The Secretary General then submits a report recommending that the Security Council approve a peacekeeping mission, along with his recommendations on size and estimated costs. (NOTE: often a small group of military observers is first approved, while more details are worked out for a full-fledged peacekeeping mission)

The Security Council votes on a resolution establishing the mission for a fixed period of time, while asking the Secretary General for periodic reports.

A Security Council vote to extend a mandate is always preceded by a report from the Secretary General.

TIMELINES FOR RECENTLY APPROVED PEACEKEEPING MISSIONS

(NOTE: some steps in each case have been omitted in the interest of brevity)

GEORGIA

September, 1992: Security Council requests periodic reports from the Secretary General.

October-June: Secretary General sends "good offices" missions and Special Envoy.

June, 1993: Georgian President requests UN military observers.

July 1, 1993: Secretary General recommends 50 U.N. military observers.

August 6, 1993: Security Council approves 10 U.N. military observers.

August 24, 1993: Security Council approves UN observer mission in Georgia, UNOMIG (88 observers authorized).

NOTE: Subsequent Security Council action has revised the UNOMIG size and mandate.

RWANDA

February/March 93: Rwanda and Uganda ask for UN assistance.

March 12, 1993: Security Council asks Secretary General to explore the situation.

April, 1993: UN team visits Rwanda.

May, 1993: Secretary General recommends UNAMIR (UN observer mission, Rwanda).

June, 1993: Security Council authorizes UNAMIR.

September, 1993: Secretary General recommends a Rwanda peacekeeping operation, UNAMIR (UN assistance mission, Rwanda).

October, 1993: Security Council approves UNAMIR.

LIBERIA

November, 1992: Security Council ask Secretary General to review Liberia (in response to Liberian request).

August 4, 1993: Secretary General recommends 30 UN military observers.

August 10, 1993: Security Council approves 30 UN military observers.

September 9, 1993: Secretary General recommends UNOMIL.

September 12, 1993: Security Council approves UNOMIL.

HAITI

February 1993: UN and OAS establish an International Civilian Mission.

July 3, 1993: Governor's Island agreement signed.

July 27, 1993: Government of Haiti requests UN aid.

August 25, 1993: Secretary General recommends UNMIH.

August 31, 1993: Security Council approves 30 man advance team (one month mandate).

September 21, 1993: Secretary General again recommends UNMIH.

September 23, 1993: Security Council approves UNMIH.

TRIBUTE TO EUGENE CALLAHAN

HON. JERRY F. COSTELLO

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 9, 1993

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to an outstanding public servant and the former "third Senator" from the State of Illinois, Mr. Eugene Callahan.

Gene Callahan worked for over 25 years as the top aide to many of Illinois' most prominent and successful political figures, including Senator PAUL SIMON and former Senator Alan J. Dixon.

He has been a leader for both Members of Congress and their staffs for many years, and his talents were recently recognized by National Journal in a long profile of his outstanding career.

Mr. Speaker, I ask permission to include the following profile of Gene Callahan in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

[From National Journal, Oct. 2, 1993]

BASEBALL'S BIG HITTER IN WASHINGTON

(By W. John Moore)

Talk a little baseball with Gene Callahan and you realize that this transplanted midwesterner is no ordinary fan. He played baseball in grade school, high school and at Illinois College. "I saw my first [Major League] game in 1945, the last year the Chicago Cubs won the pennant." Callahan recalled in a recent interview. Every summer when he was a boy, he and his uncle drove the 96 miles to Chicago's Wrigley Field to see a Cubs game.

In college, Callahan saw his first St. Louis Cardinals game—the beginning of true fandom. Although he lived more than 90 miles away, in Springfield, Ill., Callahan attended 22 Cardinal home games one summer. "I've seen 27 opening games," he said. "To me, opening day is the greatest sporting event there is, better than a World Series, an All-Star Game or anything."

Maybe the game's in his genes. His father played professional ball. His son signed with the San Diego Padres, played a year in the minors and now coaches baseball at Eastern Illinois University.

In January, Callahan, 59, finally did what most fans only dream about: He turned his passion into a job by becoming the first head of Major League Baseball's new Washington

office. One reward is good seats at Oriole Park at Camden Yards. This season, Callahan said, he's missed only seven Baltimore Oriole home games.

With the position of director of governmental relations comes an office that looks like a cubbyhole in Cooperstown. Pennants of all Major League teams fill one wall.

A long, winding but classic Washington trek brought Callahan from a small town in downstate Illinois to one of the best jobs in the nation's capital. At Illinois College, he was the sports editor of the school newspaper for two years. Callahan wanted to be a sportswriter after college, but the only job opening at the Illinois State Register in Springfield was for a police reporter, and he took it. He worked for 10 years at the newspaper, eventually becoming its chief political reporter. That, in turn, led to a series of political jobs with top Democrats in the state: assistant press secretary to Gov. Samuel H. Shapiro, administrative assistant to then-Lt. Gov. Paul Simon and, beginning in 1973, a long stint with Alan J. Dixon, the state treasurer and later secretary of state. When Dixon was elected to the Senate in 1980, Callahan, somewhat reluctantly, came to Washington as his administrative assistant.

When Dixon was upset in last year's Democratic primary by now-Sen. Carol Moseley-Braun, Callahan started looking for a public relations job with a baseball team. He contacted the Cubs, the Chicago White Sox and the Cardinals. Although the teams had no openings, Major League Baseball wanted to establish a Washington office.

"We thought we needed a Washington office because baseball has a lot of business going on in Washington," Allan H. (Bud) Selig, the president of the Milwaukee Brewers and the chairman of Major League Baseball's Executive Council, said in a telephone interview. "And Gene came very highly recommended by people as very knowledgeable, very conscientious." Among Callahan's backers were Dixon and Sen. Herbert H. Kohl, D-Wis., a close friend of Selig's.

The high-powered lobbying firm of Timmons and Co. Inc. has long represented baseball. But the team owners "wanted someone who would speak for baseball and baseball only," Callahan said. "They wanted a proactive office that could sell baseball."

Callahan gives baseball the benefit of a dozen years of experience on Capitol Hill. "Gene has an enormous reservoir of goodwill" in the Senate, William H. Cagle, a vice president of Timmons, said. Callahan still has close ties to his former boss, Sen. Simon, a key member of the Judiciary Committee, which will soon act on the legislation most critical to Major League Baseball—a proposal to eliminate its long-standing exemption from the antitrust laws. Callahan argues that the exemption protects fans by giving baseball's commissioner the clout to stop owners from moving their teams. Removing the exemption, he adds, would also devastate the minor leagues, because teams wouldn't spend money to develop players if they were free to shift teams.

Antitrust is not the only issue that baseball faces. Some critics contend that baseball's television contracts, which always provoke a controversy, could shift more games to cable or pay TV. And House Majority Whip David E. Bonior, D-Mich., has introduced a bill that would prohibit baseball teams from demolishing their old ballparks.

Every time Major League Baseball lights a match, our critics call it major arson," Callahan said.

Baseball's biggest need right now is finding a new commissioner. The new leader of Major League Baseball could replace Callahan, though it's not likely.

But Callahan says that he won't stay in Washington forever. At some point he wants to go home to Springfield, his family and, of course, more baseball.

THE PUERTO RICO PLEBISCITE

HON. ROBERT G. TORRICELLI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 9, 1993

Mr. TORRICELLI. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, November 14, the people of Puerto Rico will exercise their right to self-determination by voting in a nonbinding plebiscite. Their choice will be: statehood, continued commonwealth, or independence. I will work to implement their will and see that Congress carries out, as soon as possible, their expression of self-determination.

I would urge Members to take note of a report issued by the Congressional Research Service last week. This report concludes—as earlier reports have also concluded—that Puerto Rican citizenship can be revoked unilaterally by Congress because it was granted only by an act of Congress in 1917. The report also concludes that under the current Commonwealth, Congress places limits on Federal funds that are given to American citizens who are residents of Puerto Rico even though that type of discrimination would not be possible if Puerto Rico were a state.

Mr. Speaker, I will be watching this Sunday's vote with great interest and excitement and I renew my commitment to honor the expressed self-determination of the people of Puerto Rico.

TRIBUTE TO MARK VAN ROTZ AND MATTHEW VOCCIO, EAGLE SCOUTS

HON. JACK REED

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 9, 1993

Mr. REED. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to salute two distinguished young men from Rhode Island who have attained the rank of Eagle Scout in the Boy Scouts of America. They are Mark Van Rotz and Matthew Voccio of Troop 22 in Johnston and they are honored this week for their noteworthy achievement.

Not every young American who joins the Boy Scouts earns the prestigious Eagle Scout Award. In fact, only 2.5 percent of all Boy Scouts do. To earn the award, a Boy Scout must fulfill requirements in the areas of leadership, service, and outdoor skills. He must earn 21 merit badges, 11 of which are required from areas such as Citizenship in the Community, Citizenship in the Nation, Citizenship in the World, Safety, Environmental Science, and First Aid.

As he progresses through the Boy Scout ranks, a Scout must demonstrate participation in increasingly more responsible service projects. He must also demonstrate leadership

skills by holding one or more specific youth leadership positions in his patrol and/or troop. These young men have distinguished themselves in accordance with these criteria.

For their Eagle Scout projects, Mark and Matthew each cleared a different section of Johnston Memorial Park of debris and undergrowth. The town of Johnston will landscape these areas for the enjoyment of the residents of the town of Johnston.

Mr. Speaker, I ask you and my colleagues to join me in saluting Eagle Scouts Mark Van Rotz and Matthew Voccio. In turn, we must duly recognize the Boy Scouts of America for establishing the Eagle Scout Award and the strenuous criteria its aspirants must meet. This program has through its 80 years honed and enhanced the leadership skills and commitment to public service of many outstanding Americans, two dozen of whom now serve in the House.

It is my sincere belief that Mark Van Rotz and Matthew Voccio will continue their public service and in so doing will further distinguish themselves and consequently better their community. I join friends, colleagues, and family who this week salute them.

TRIBUTE TO FRANK M. LEMAY

HON. JACK BROOKS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 9, 1993

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, today, I bring to the attention of my colleagues the passing away of Frank M. Lemay, a senior State Department economist, who warned in 1989 of evidence that U.S. loan guarantees to Iraq were being used illegally to build Baghdad's military arsenal.

Mr. Lemay testified before the Committee on the Judiciary in June 1992 concerning the contents of a memorandum he wrote in 1989 that Iraq apparently had spent part of a \$1.8 billion loan package to buy nuclear arms technology illegally. The loans had been guaranteed by the Department of Agriculture's Commodity Credit Corporation, ostensibly to purchase U.S. farm products.

Mr. Speaker, when Mr. Lemay testified before the Judiciary Committee his testimony was riveting. I was struck by his refusal to back down from the contents of his memorandum in the face of such intense scrutiny and obvious pressure by the administration and the Congress. He took full responsibility for the contents of his memo and testified that he had no motivation to lie about any of the information contained in the memo. He came across as honest, diligent, and loyal. Throughout that long morning, he never lost his cool.

Mr. Lemay was a 12-year veteran of the State Department. He served as a consular officer and assistant services officer in the Dominican Republic, a staff aide to the assistant secretary of state for inter-American affairs, a policy planning officer in the Bureau of Inter-American Affairs and deputy director of the economic section of the U.S. Embassy in Colombia. More recently, he served as a senior economist in the policy planning office of the Secretary of State.

His was an accomplished career that I am sure will be remembered in the years to come.

KEY DOCUMENTS PROVE INNOCENCE OF JOSEPH OCCHIPINTI

HON. JAMES A. TRAFICANT, JR.

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 9, 1993

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, as part of my continuing efforts to bring to light all the facts in the case of former Immigration and Naturalization Service Agent Joseph Occhipinti, I submit into the RECORD additional key evidence in this case.

EXHIBIT C—AFFIDAVIT

1. On April 21, 1992, I executed an affidavit for Staten Island Borough President Guy V. Molinari where I provided testimony that former Federal Agent Joseph Occhipinti was set up by my major Dominican drug lords Jose Liberato, Elias Taveras and others.

2. I voluntarily agreed to work in an undercover capacity to help expose the conspiracy and prove that the complainants who testified against Mr. Occhipinti are involved in criminal activity. My investigation disclosed the following evidence:

(a) On or about April 28, 1992, I met with Jose Elias Taveras at his garage, Concourse Auto Repair, located at 245 East 138th Street, Bronx, New York 10451. Mr. Taveras believes I am a drug dealer and offered to sell me his business. I agreed to buy his garage for \$125,000 in order to help me launder my drug money. I explained to Mr. Taveras my concerns that I could not have a legal sales contract since I was a drug dealer who doesn't pay taxes, and I didn't want problems with IRS. During the conversation Mr. Taveras admitted to me having financial problems and that he was involved with a loan shark called "Benny", who works for Sea Crest Trading Company. While at the garage I had a conversation with Mr. Taveras brother who admitted to me and others that his brother, Elias has set up Occhipinti and head him convicted. At the garage, was a uniformed New York City Police Officer, called Jackson, Badge #1544. According to Mr. Taveras, the officer was Dominican and was a personal friend. Elias told me it was "OK" to talk business in front of him but I didn't. Elias and I finally agreed to draw up a contract showing the selling price to be \$40,000 not \$125,000. The conversation was tape recorded an attached is Mr. Taveras business card.

(b) On or about April 29, 1992, Mr. Taveras arranged an appointment with me and his attorney, Nestor Rosado, at his law office located at 2710 Broadway, New York, New York. The purpose of the meeting was to close on the business deal for the garage. In a conversation with Mr. Rosado I explained to him the fact I was a drug dealer and could not show on the contract the selling price of \$125,000. We all agreed that the contract would show \$40,000 and the fact I gave a \$25,000 deposit, the balance would be paid off in installments. Mr. Rosado was aware that this transaction was illegal and voluntarily went ahead to fill out the legal papers. I eventually left the office to get the \$125,000, but never returned. I made up an excuse I had been arrested on an outstanding warrant. Attached is a copy of Mr. Rosado's business card. The conversation was tape recorded.

(c) On or about April 23, 1992 I had a conversation with complainant Rhadames Liberato at the Medina Grocery located at 1502 St. Nicholas Avenue, New York. In the conversation, I discussed with Rhadames about the sale of cocaine and loan sharking activities with Sea Crest Trading. Also, I supplied Rhadames Liberato with my telephone number in the event he wants a new source for cocaine. While at the Bodega, two drug deals took place involving employees. The conversation was tape recorded.

3. This affidavit has been given freely and voluntarily. No promises or threats were made in exchange for my testimony. My undercover investigation is still ongoing.

EXHIBIT D—AFFIDAVIT

My true and correct name is * * *.

I am a native and citizen of the Dominican Republic and resident of the State of New York.

I was a registered informant for the Drug Enforcement Administration during the periods of 1988 until June, 1991. I also work as an informant for the U.S. Secret Service, Alcohol, Tobacco and Fire Arms and the New York City Police Department. I primarily worked with the DEA Group 33 Unit which investigated mostly Dominican Drug Dealers. (Attached as Exhibit A is DEA Form 356 which reflects my employment record with DEA).

On or about November, 1991, I had a conversation with Elias Taveras, a good personal friend from the street, who owns the Yeya Grocery in upper Manhattan. Mr. Taveras knew me because I had a friend who was selling him drivers licenses in different names. Mr. Taveras was bragging to me how he was responsible in convicting a federal agent from Immigration for stealing money and doing an illegal search of his bodega. He personally admitted to me that he lied to the jury about the theft of monies and the illegal searches. Mr. Taveras also told me that a Dominican woman called Altigracia Crucey, who owns a Bodega on Broadway near West 162nd Street, New York, New York was also one of the witnesses who also falsely testified against the Immigration Officer. I had personally known about Altigracia Crucey from three local Dominican Drug dealers called, Arturo, Moreno and Junior, who admitted to me that Altigracia was their source of heroin. As for Mr. Taveras, he is involved in the sale of numbers, gambling, illegal drug money transfers to the Dominican Republic and also arranging drug sales. About six times I was present when Mr. Taveras arranged as middle man to buy cocaine and received a commission. The names of the people who bought the Drugs were Adalberto, Manolo, Jose and the others I don't remember at this time. The reason why we had the conversation was because I told him I had seen him on Spanish television.

On or about January, 1992, I met Jose Liberato at his new Bodega at West 163rd Street and Broadway, New York. I was with a friend called Angel Ignacio who was negotiating the sale of 11 kilos of Cocaine. I was not present for all the actual price negotiation for the drugs because Liberato and Angel went into a private office. After the private conversation, I went to the office and we began to drink. Mr. Liberato began to brag how he "the federales". He was explaining that when the Immigration had gone to his Bodega they never found 18 kilograms of cocaine that was secreted in a hidden floor panel. He explained that he had falsely testified against the Officer in court about stealing money and doing illegal

searches because they (Federales/Immigration) were hurting the Bodega owners who he had lent money to. Mr. Liberato, is a loan shark. Mr. Liberato lends money to Bodega owners at high interest rate. Mr. Liberato explained that Immigration was arresting people and seizing contraband at the Bodegas which owed him money, and was creating a lot of problems for him. So, he and others organized many of the Bodegas to falsely testify against the officer. Many of the Bodega owners were family members. I personally know that Mr. Liberato is a major distributor of cocaine, who could handle purchases of 50 to 100 kilo's at a time. At this meeting, he admitted that he was smuggling the cocaine into the United States in frozen "Yuka", which is Spanish vegetable. About two weeks later, I accompanied Angel Ignacio back to Liberato in order to pick up a sample of the cocaine. The sample was about a one ounce rock of cocaine. Mr. Liberato is a very dangerous man, who was very close friends of a Cuban man called "Papito," a known Assassin who owns the El Baturito Restaurant. I personally know about the people that was murdered through Papito—it is common knowledge that no one crosses Liberato or they get murdered.

I ceased being a DEA Informant in June, 1991 after I had a problem with a Federal prosecutor called David Lewis. I negotiated the sale of 2 kilos of cocaine in 1989 from a Dominican Drug Dealer called "Luis". The case went to trial and I explained to Mr. Lewis what happened in the buy. Sometime thereafter, Luis approached my mother and threatened her. I was extremely afraid for my mother and family's safety, so I decided that this was one case I should not testify in. I had never had a family member threatened before. So, at a second meeting, I changed my story with Mr. Lewis about what happened. Eventually, I explained to Mr. Lewis the truth and why I didn't want to testify. Mr. Lewis was not sympathetic to my concerns about my families safety. He directed that DEA no longer use me as an informant. It should be noted that at that time, I was working on a major investigation involving a Dominican lawyer called "Aranda", from the law offices of Aranda and Guthelein. I had learned that Aranda was representing Dominican Drug Dealers and receiving cocaine as payment. One day in June, 1991, I met with Aranda at the Court House in Manhattan in order to negotiate the purchase of 5 kilos of cocaine. He agreed to sell it to me. However, when I reported it to DEA, they told me that they couldn't work the case because of my problem with David Lewis.

On or about February, 1992, I went to Immigration to speak to one of its officers. At that time, I learned that the Immigration Officer who was set up by Mr. Liberato and others was Joseph Occhipinti. I never personally met Mr. Occhipinti or knew him previously. I saw him only on two occasions at DEA. When I realized what happened, I reported it to DEA Special Agent the evidence I had.

I am willing to testify before court or the Congress as to the facts contained in this affidavit. I voluntarily agree to work in an undercover capacity to prove that Mr. Occhipinti was set up and that Mr. Liberato, Mr. Taveras and Ms. Crucey are involved in drug trafficking and related criminal activity. No promises or threats were made in exchange for this affidavit or my offer to work undercover.

TRIBUTE TO ONLINE RESOURCES & COMMUNICATION CORP.

HON. JAMES P. MORAN

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 9, 1993

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take just a moment to tell you of an exciting development that has taken place in my district. I think it demonstrates what can happen when a small company with dedicated employees commits itself to finding a better way.

A constituent company has just received a major patent for a new low-cost, efficient and easy-to-use system that will help make the information superhighway more accessible and less expensive for consumers.

Online Resources & Communications Corp. of McLean, VA, has accomplished this remarkable technological feat not by spending millions of dollars developing a new solution, but by ingeniously combined existing technology infrastructures to create a new system for paying for electronic services delivered to home. Combining public telecommunications data networks with the automated teller machine, or ATM, networks of the banking industry, Online Resources helps keep the cost for such services low.

Because Online is committed to delivering low-cost banking and retail services electronically to the home, it's been recognized as a leader in its field. Its low cost ScreenPhone has received rave reviews in the press and from thousands of consumers in the Washington area who use Online's home banking service for only a few dollars a month. Now banks nationwide are calling Online Resources to learn of its unique and low-cost system.

I'm very proud of what the employees of Online Resources have accomplished because they've proven once again that small companies are leading the way in developing new technological solutions that will ensure our national competitiveness. We cannot, Mr. Speaker, ask the American people to pay high prices for the services and information that will make them more aware and more informed while at the same time less hassled by life's day-to-day chores. Online's systems can help give Americans that rare combination of convenience and control over their financial affairs that will make them more productive.

Online's patent for this payment method is a breakthrough for the banking and telecommunications industries. And to its credit, Online Resources' plans are to use the patent responsibly to help accelerate the acceptance and adoption of electronic services in the home. President Matt Lawlor tells me he wants industry leaders to come together to adopt standards that will ensure that the consumer is always foremost. He plans to continue to promulgate to the industry Online's low-cost, easy-to-use approach because the employees of Online recognize that as a provider of electronic services to the home, they have a responsibility to serve as many Americans as they can.

Mr. Speaker, we hear a lot these days about industry giants forming alliances to develop new technologies. But I hope this body always remembers that the truly great ideas,

the unique jewels of creative thinking, often come from smaller companies that are dedicated to finding a better way for a lower cost. That's exactly what Online Resources, a company of just 30 people, has been recognized for with the issuance of this patent. I ask you and the members of the House to stand with me to applaud Online Resources as one of the truly innovative companies of our era.

**TRIBUTE TO SUZANNE DE PASSE
AND MIMI AND BERNIE WEST**

HON. HENRY A. WAXMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

HON. HOWARD L. BERMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 9, 1993

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, we ask our colleagues to join us in paying tribute to three outstanding supporters of the Friends of the Los Angeles Free Clinic.

At its annual dinner show on December 2, the Los Angeles Free Clinic will honor Suzanne de Passe and Mimi and Bernie West for their unstinting efforts to extend quality health care to those who have fallen through the cracks of our current inadequate health care system.

Ms. de Passe and Mr. and Mrs. West have built the Los Angeles Free Clinic into a nationally known and admired institution. The free clinic provides a full range of high quality health services to those without health insurance, those who are ineligible for government health programs, and those who have personal problems and health needs that require the clinic's unique atmosphere of tolerance and compassion.

Were it not for the efforts of individuals like Suzanne de Passe and Mimi and Bernie West, it would be impossible for the free clinic to provide state-of-the-art medical, psychological, legal and dental services to tens of thousands of clients without ever levying a charge. As we pay tribute to Suzanne de Passe and Mimi and Bernie West, we should also recognize the hard work of the staff, contributors, and volunteers who make possible the free clinic's treatment of 40,000 needy patients each year.

**SEMATECH PROVES TO BE IDEAL
GOVERNMENT/INDUSTRY CON-
SORTIUM**

HON. J.J. PICKLE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 9, 1993

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, SEMATECH, the 6-year-old Austin semiconductor manufacturing research consortium, has reached the summit in the existence of Government-subsidized consortiums. Founded during a crisis in the U.S. semiconductor industry, SEMATECH "has achieved its early goal of reviving this country's chip-making powers to match or beat the Japanese, say SEMATECH

officials and supporters of the consortium," according to this past Sunday's Austin American Statesman.

The well-being of the American chip industry and its equipment suppliers, once considered in trouble, has shown signs of revival in the past 2 years. SEMATECH has played a role in keeping jobs at home by making it possible to produce state-of-the-art semiconductors on all American-made machines.

Advanced tools and processes have enabled U.S. companies to move from dawdler to forerunner in chip manufacturing technology. SEMATECH can also claim credit for improving communication between equipment manufacturers and chip makers within the industry.

The Austin American Statesman article goes on to say, that now that its success has been proclaimed, the consortium may need an encore performance. The key to a new stage, according to SEMATECH's chief executive William Spencer, is to do more work with less money. This year the consortium has broadened its research scope, shifted spending priorities and cut spending by 10 percent, or \$20 million a year. SEMATECH's 11 industrial members put up half, or \$90 million, of the organization's annual budget. The Department of Defense Appropriations Conference Report for fiscal year 1994 will appropriate \$90 million from the Defense Department's Advanced Research Projects Agency.

President Clinton last February called SEMATECH, "a model for Federal consortiums funded to advance other critical technologies." A congressional field hearing was held in Austin this past summer by the Science and Technology Committee and "was more of a love feast than an inquiry: everyone from Governor Ann Richards of Texas to the House Majority Leader, Richard A. Gephardt, heaped praise on SEMATECH," according to this past Sunday's New York Times.

The New York Times also states that other industries now hold up SEMATECH as an example for American industry. The aerospace industry, increasingly threatened by Europe's Airbus consortium, would benefit from proposed legislation that helped create and finance a consortium called Aerotech. American textile manufacturers have created a consortium called AMTex that receives Government assistance. And the Big Three auto companies recently announced a Government-backed partnership to design a fuel-efficient super car.

Congress should be proud of starting this highly successful consortium and promoting U.S. success in international competition in the semiconductor industry. SEMATECH should be a model for all industries to join together keeping the United States a step ahead of foreign competitors in high technology.

**NATIONAL SCIENCE AND TECH-
NOLOGY POLICY, ORGANIZATION,
AND PRIORITIES ACT AMEND-
MENTS OF 1993**

HON. RICK BOUCHER

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 9, 1993

Mr. BOUCHER. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing, along with Mr. BROWN of California

and Mr. BOEHLERT of New York, the National Science and Technology Policy, Organization, and Priorities Act Amendments of 1993.

This legislation is the culmination of an ongoing review of U.S. science policy conducted by the Subcommittee on Science. Our review was conducted against a backdrop of a dramatically changed world. New opportunities and new challenges for the Nation's research enterprise have been created by the end of the cold war, the rise of multilateral economic competition, and the emergency of global environmental problems. Coupled with these changes is the increasing role of science and technology in promoting our economic well-being and our quality of life.

The subcommittee conducted a broad-based inquiry into the adequacy of the Nation's Federal science and technology policy and the directions that policy should take as we approach the 21st century. Our goal from the beginning has been to shape science policies that allocate resources more efficiently, set priorities more clearly, and measure performance more precisely, while at the same time preserving the best parts of a research system that remains the envy of the world.

Our inquiry was also driven by the inability of the Government's growing research and development budgets to keep pace with the explosive growth in the size of the Nation's research force. We also had to consider the ever-present debate about the effect of "Big Science" undertakings such as the human genome project and the space station on the size and number of grants available to individual researchers who collectively account for much of the Nation's innovation. The time has arrived for hard decisions to be made about the research and development projects that are most important to enhancing our quality of life.

At the core of our legislation is an effective mechanism for the Federal Government both to establish long-term science priorities and to assure that those priorities are reflected in the budget. To achieve this result, the bill requires the President, in consultation with the Office of Science and Technology Policy [OSTP] and the Office of Management and Budget [OMB], to report annually to the Congress on the administration's specific priorities for science and technology, along with the rationale for those policies and a statement setting forth how they will address long-term societal goals.

This report will also present one consolidated national research and development budget, which is intended to bring coherence to a more than \$70 billion research budget that is scattered across more than 20 departments and agencies. It addresses those critics who charge, with some justification in my view, that American science cannot be all things to all people—that we must set priorities.

To assure that the President's science policies will actually be reflected in the budget, the legislation gives greater responsibilities to OSTP in formulating the Federal science and technology budget. Under the bill, OSTP and OMB are required to work jointly at every stage of the budget process. Most importantly, the bill requires OMB to obtain the concurrence of OSTP before transmitting final budget guidance to Federal departments and agencies. This concurrence authority will help to

assure that the final budget guidance which is transmitted to the agencies will be consistent with the President's science priorities and the administration's broader societal goals.

This provision also recognizes the unique position that science and technology has in the Federal budget and is consistent with the key recommendation contained in the Carnegie Commission's report, "Enabling the Future: Linking Science and Technology to Societal Goals."

The bill will improve science policy in several other important respects:

First, it will codify the National Science and Technology Council [NSTC] that was recommended by the National Performance Review. The Council will parallel the National Economic Council and the National Security Council. It will bring high-level decisionmaking to science and technology policy.

The NSTC replaces the Federal Coordinating Council for Science, Engineering, and Technology [FCCSET], which in the words of the National Performance Review, "lacks the teeth to set priorities, direct policy, and participate fully in the budget process." The bill does, however, preserve what I believe are the best elements of the FCCSET process. It authorizes the NSTC to establish interagency working groups comprised of officials who work directly with the research and development projects that cut across agency boundaries.

Second, the bill sets up a Committee of Advisers on Science and Technology to provide the President with regular advice and recommendations on science and technology issues. I think all of us would agree that when dealing with these often complex matters, it is critically important for the President to be able to turn to a balanced panel of eminent scientists who can render advice free of agency bias.

Third, the legislation establishes for the first time a regular specific assessment of the Nation's research capabilities. This function will be carried out by the National Sciences and Technologies Assessment Panel, comprised of distinguished Americans from Government and the private sector. This reconstituted panel will continue to report biennially to the President on technologies that it deems critical. The President will be responsible for the development of a multiyear strategy for federally supported research and development of critical technologies.

Mr. Speaker, the legislation that I am introducing today achieves the goals of an improved science policy—one that will help our Nation set clear priorities in science, adhere to those priorities in the budget, and most importantly, measure the results of our enormous investment in research and development. This bill is wholly consistent with the President's re-inventing government initiative and with the recommendations of some of America's leading scientists and public policy experts, many of whom served on an advisory committee to the subcommittee during the development of this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, the Carnegie Commission summed it up well when it said, "America faces a choice between business as usual in science and technology policy and a new approach that would place more emphasis on

long-term S&T goals and on clarifying the linkages between the S&T enterprise and societal goals."

This legislation meets the challenge that is implicit in these words. I urge my colleagues to join as cosponsors of this important measure.

HONORING ITALIAN BENEFICIAL CLUB ON THE OCCASION OF THEIR 60TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. PAUL E. GILLMOR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 9, 1993

Mr. GILLMOR. Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to take this opportunity to pay tribute to the Sandusky-based Italian Beneficial Club on the occasion of its 60th year of service.

On November 13, 1993, a dinner will be held to pay tribute to the club's 60 years of continuing service to the Italian community of Sandusky. The club has provided social, cultural, and educational facilities for approximately 5,500 members, including information on obtaining citizenship for immigrants.

Named after the Italian mapmaker, Amerigo Vespucci, the new world and our Nation's history is filled with the hard work and labor of Italian families. Ohioans need to look no farther than our State capitol to see the admiration the new world feels for the great Italian explorer, Christopher Columbus.

As the club marks its 60th anniversary, we commemorate the past and celebrate the future. The anxieties and doubts faced by the immigrants of today are no less than 100 years ago. The Italian Beneficial Club can be a link between Italian culture and heritage and American opportunity.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating the members of the Italian Beneficial Club for their past achievements and encouraging them to continue to hold themselves to its high standard of integrity and dedication.

IN SUPPORT OF FOREIGN-BASED MEDICAL SCHOOLS

HON. ELIOT L. ENGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 9, 1993

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, the President has unveiled to the American people his specific plans to reform the Nation's health care system and has taken a bold step to inspire fundamental change in the manner in which Americans receive health care. The American people are now looking to Congress to assure that reform efforts are equitable, fair, and affordable.

A major focus of the President's package involves the need to increase the number of doctors providing primary care services. Today, too many new physicians elect to practice specialized medicine where they can earn higher salaries. As a result, there is a defi-

ciency in the number of physicians that practice general family health care or primary health care.

I would like to direct my colleagues attention to the efforts of Dr. Robert Ross, chairman and founder of Ross University School of Medicine located on the Island of Dominica in the Caribbean. Dr. Ross has greatly contributed to reversing the trend of declining numbers of primary care physicians. Dr. Ross opened Ross University in 1978 with just 13 students. Since that time, over 1,500 students have received medical degrees from the university.

The graduates from Ross University have continued on into medical residency training and medical practice all over the United States. In addition, many Ross University graduates have set up their primary care practices in rural and urban areas that would otherwise go without proper medical care. These foreign born or trained medical students help fill the critical shortage of primary care physicians produced by American medical schools. In fact, over 20 percent of the practicing doctors in the States of Michigan, North Dakota, Illinois, Connecticut, and Delaware were educated outside the United States. In New Jersey, the figure is 33 percent in New York it is nearly 50 percent.

Dr. Ross and his foreign-based medical school provide a valuable service to the American people. U.S. health care policy should encourage, not discourage, such contributions. As Congress begins debate on health care reform, I urge my colleagues to examine the great contribution foreign medical schools can make with respect to primary care.

THE HALPERIN NOMINATION

HON. PHILIP M. CRANE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 9, 1993

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, I have been heartened by the increase in attention and opposition to the nomination of Dr. Morton Halperin to be the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Democracy and Peacekeeping.

Nothing in Dr. Halperin's background would lead a rational, dispassionate observer to the conclusion that he should be given an important post in the Pentagon. To the contrary, that observer might well conclude that the Pentagon is the last place Dr. Halperin should be working.

What is even more disturbing is the tactic pursued by his supporters. Unable to defend his record and actions, supporters of the nomination have resorted to attempts to discredit those who raise legitimate questions about the nomination.

I am inserting for the RECORD a response to a Washington Post editorial written by the ranking member of the Senate Armed Services Committee, Senator STROM THURMOND. He responds to some of the slanderous attacks he has endured and further outlines the concerns about Dr. Halperin.

The fact of the matter is that Dr. Halperin has engaged in activities which raise serious questions about his judgment and qualifications. If there are answers to those questions,

his supporters should be supportive of our attempts to discover them.

[From the Washington Post, Oct. 18, 1993]

THE HALPERIN NOMINATION

(By Strom Thurmond)

An Oct. 11 editorial carried a staunch defense of Morton Halperin, nominated to be assistant secretary of Defense for Democracy and Peacekeeping. While such an editorial, which did not offer an outline of the concerns I shared with fellow members of the Senate, is your prerogative, I feel entitled to reply.

Mr. Halperin's troubles are not the fault of a "partisan hit squad" or of the Senate Armed Services Committee. In fact, Republican members of the committee have avoided partisan battles over Defense Department nominees. With little dissent, we have voted to confirm every Department of Defense nominee—even those about whom we have serious reservations. Rather, Mr. Halperin's problems are of his own making, the inevitable result of the controversial 30-year record that the editorial cited.

The questions about Mr. Halperin's qualifications and motives are far more serious than any the committee has encountered, and our concern is broad-based and bipartisan. Mr. Halperin's record shows a man whose judgment about the nature of conflict and international relations is deeply flawed. He is a leading advocate of subordinating U.S. military power to multilateral interests in the apparent belief that the United States can't be trusted to act unilaterally for the good of mankind.

It is true that recent news stories reporting Mr. Halperin's advice not to send additional equipment to protect our troops relied on unnamed sources. But that should be nothing new to The Post. They are nameless because they are military officers whose careers will be destroyed if they speak out publicly. It is to their credit that they are willing to come forward, even in anonymity, out of concern for American lives. After all, Department of Defense nominations—unlike domestic policy appointments—can be a matter of life and death.

In the days since these stories appeared and I expressed my concern on the floor of the Senate, Pentagon spokeswoman Kathleen deLaski is reported to have admitted that on the subject of Mr. Halperin's influence she does not know "what he might have said in conversations to people in this building."

To many of us, Somalia is a clear case of Halperinism at work, a striking example of how bad policy can result in dead young Americans. Our country now appears to be embarking on an even more ill-defined and ill-conceived operation in Haiti, and there are indications that Mr. Halperin had a hand in its design as well.

Republican members have good reason to believe that Mr. Halperin's advice will lead to more United Nations "peacekeeping" operations like Somalia. Possibly more Americans will be killed or wounded for no clear national purpose. Consequently, we have no choice but to oppose him.

I believe senators of both parties have a moral obligation to make sure that his kind of misguided and discredited policy does not gain a beach-head of influence in the Pentagon.

TRIBUTE TO THE ADELPHI UNIVERSITY SCHOOL OF NURSING

HON. EDOLPHUS TOWNS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 9, 1993

Mr. TOWNS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to pay special tribute to the Adelphi University School of Nursing. Inaugurated in 1943 by Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt as part of the United States Nurse Cadet Corps, the Adelphi University School of Nursing became the first baccalaureate nursing program on Long Island. It is one of the preeminent schools of nursing in the country. Adelphi offers a state-of-the-art curricula and awards undergraduate, masters, and doctoral degrees. It also offers continuing education courses in nursing. Graduates of the school hold prestigious positions in nursing and have earned national and international distinction.

This school exemplifies the ethic of social responsibility in preparing its students to meet the challenges that health care providers face in a rapidly changing world. The institution has proven itself as a forerunner in the health care field. As a major center for advanced clinical practice and research, the school has modified its curriculum to respond to new needs and knowledge.

The school is accredited by the National League for Nursing and the Continuing Education Program by the American Nurses Association. It maintains affiliations with more than 100 health care facilities and hospitals in the greater New York metropolitan area and throughout the Nation.

It is with great pride that I commend this institution.

SUPPORTING THE NORTH AMERICAN FREE-TRADE AGREEMENT

HON. BOB CLEMENT

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 9, 1993

Mr. CLEMENT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to endorse the North American Free-Trade Agreement. Throughout modern history, the world has come to view America as a trendsetter and worldwide leader. As the Earth's remaining superpower, America has the responsibility to take leadership roles that forge new paths of international economic cooperation. NAFTA offers us that opportunity.

The 103d Congress has the plan before it today to create the world's largest trading partnership. With nearly 360 million consumers and an annual production rate of over \$6 trillion, North America will undoubtedly become the single most vital and influential market on the globe.

Lowering our trade barriers and expanding our economic markets just makes good common economic sense. If I were to approach any small business in America and tell them that I had the ability to open and broaden the market for their goods with a minimal increase in competition, do you not think they would jump at the chance? Of course they would; it makes good common sense.

After World War II, America and its Allies were embroiled in the controversial debate of whether or not to commit themselves to rebuilding and reconstructing strong economies in Germany and Japan. The theory at the time was that there were only so many riches to go around, and increased investment in these countries would result in decreased wealth at home. Fortunately, America and her Allies did not heed this assumption and looked toward the long-term benefit of economic investment in these wrecked economies. As a result of this foresight, the average person in the world today has a much higher standard of living than in those days, even while the population has increased exponentially. More importantly, for many of those years the United States was a net exporter to both Germany and Japan, creating thousands of American jobs.

The current problem facing working men and women is much more complex than can be summed up in this NAFTA debate. The bottom line is that while NAFTA will have a positive impact on this country by itself, the positive effect of this treaty is not the cureall for our Nation's economy. Overall, it is estimated that there will be a net increase in the first year of over 170,000 jobs in our Nation's work force, a drop in the bucket for a nation with 240 million residents. Instead, our leaders must be willing to create opportunities that improve the skills of our work force and invest in the education of our children.

In my home State of Tennessee, we have increased our trade with Mexico and Canada by over 310 percent in the past 5 years, becoming the 15th largest exporter of American goods to Mexico. Last year alone, Tennessee exports to Mexico were valued at over \$413 million. Tennessee's trade with Mexico will certainly strengthen with NAFTA, creating an increase in export-related jobs for our citizens.

At issue here, however, is America's willingness to reach out to new markets for its products and end the status quo. America continues to lose jobs without NAFTA and we no longer can afford to sit back and watch our labor move to Pacific rim countries that have ineffective labor, environmental, and minimum wage laws.

The North American Free-Trade Agreement is about investment in our national economic security in the long term. This country cannot afford to adopt the position that continued closed borders and tariff restrictions are in the best interest of its citizens. Failure to pass NAFTA sends a strong and clear message to those currently involved in the GATT Treaty negotiations that the North American region is ill prepared to serve in a 110-nation trade agreement, virtually ensuring the failure of these discussions.

Mr. Speaker, this NAFTA gives us the opportunity to invest in a country that has one of the fastest growing economies in the Western Hemisphere with nearly unlimited potential for future growth. That country is Mexico. Already, lowered trade restrictions with Mexico have made that country our third largest trading partner behind Canada and Japan and the second largest export market for manufactured goods. Furthermore, Mexico is the third largest market for United States agricultural products. With over 225,000 jobs in America directly dependent upon trade with Mexico, another

700,000 United States jobs indirectly dependent upon trade with Mexico, and 45 of the 50 States in America reporting increases in trade with Mexico since 1986, it becomes quite clear that free trade with Mexico is good for American workers and manufacturers.

The debate over NAFTA has been a long journey that has forced Americans to take a second look at our Nation's international trading partnerships. I intend to support NAFTA based upon my belief that this country can no longer afford to leave its borders closed in the face of an increasing global economy and this NAFTA creates jobs for our Nation's workers. I urge my colleagues to take a bold stand for investment in our country and support this NAFTA.

ELLA JONES: A COMMITTED LEADER, A SUCCESSFUL ORGANIZER

HON. RICHARD W. POMBO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 9, 1993

Mr. POMBO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to demonstrate special recognition for Miss Ella Jones, a constituent residing in Stockton, CA.

Miss Jones has demonstrated exceptional leadership in making the Village East Apartments in Stockton a safer place to live.

She received recognition recently for her accomplishments by receiving a prestigious Jefferson Award from the American Institute for Public Service. From 40,000 nominees nationwide, 150 finalists were chosen. Of these, only five, including Ella, were named national award winners for their remarkable achievements.

Mr. Speaker, this is Ella Jones story. Ella Jones has been living in the Village East public housing complex since 1969. During the 1970's, she helped organize a tenant's association and served as its president. The association's activities were primarily recreational, and focused on the children. Eventually, drug and gang troubles became a dangerous issue.

In 1982, Michael McCormick, a youth of 19, died of a stab wound in the chest. The argument which finally caused his death began at the apartment complex, but ended at a local vocational school. He was Ella's son.

In 1983-84, local gangs were in the area and occasional beatings and shootings occurred in the neighborhood regarding drugs. A territorial dispute between members within the same gangs occurred, and a member was shot and killed on the property. Neither the victim nor the killers, which were arrested, were residents of the complex. The issue was gang territory.

In 1987, the city of Stockton was forced to cut back its police department. This coincided with the arrival of the Bloods and Crips, gangs from the larger urban areas of Los Angeles and San Francisco.

Problems continued to ebb and flow in the complex. In March 1988, a blind youth, John Riley, an innocent bystander, was caught in the crossfire of gang activity and killed.

In June 1988, the Stockton Record reported on Ella Jones' efforts to rid Village East of drug-related criminal activity. The Record cited

her efforts to patrol the complex with her megaphone. She quizzed children and youth about why they were hanging out at Village East, determining whether or not they actually had relatives, friends, or reasons to be there. Her involvement earned the respect of gang leaders because she was not afraid to confront them.

Helva Doyle, who assisted Jones, wasn't so lucky. She had her car windows shot out in reprisal.

In 1990, a brother of a gang member was shot and killed on the property. Both boys were residents. Management established a job training program with the Boys and Girls Club to employ residents and neighborhood youth to teach them construction skills. The youth were involved in making repairs in the complex. The intent of the program was to provide skills, distract teens from the street, and to provide income.

In September 1992, the San Joaquin Prevention Partnership awarded Village East and the Boys and Girls Club \$5,000 toward recreational equipment and programs on safety and substance abuse.

Ella Smith participates in the San Joaquin Prevention Partnership. The partnership's vision is "an empowered community that collectively addresses issues to assure a Safe, Healthy, and Drug-Free Environment." Their mission statement continues, "through collaborative public and private prevention efforts, the prevention partnership will plan, coordinate, and develop programs, services, and resources based on community priorities and will enhance and assist leadership."

A three-bedroom unit has been transformed into an activity center in which to provide after school recreational and educational activities for the 260 children of the complex. Ella Jones is now the program coordinator. Her job description includes coordinating the above-mentioned activities, as well as health care—eye exams, blood pressure clinics, and so forth—for residents and activities geared toward seniors and the disabled.

In 1989, over 100 residents of the Village East neighborhood staged their first "Just Say No" anti-drug rally. The "Just Say No" Club was started with the interest earned from residents' security deposits. The coordinator of these activities is Ella Jones.

Much of her drive, enthusiasm and commitment to the cleaning up process occurs through this club, which involves youth from 3 or 4 on up to 15 years of age. With the children continuously involved, parents become aware, involved and finally committed to standing up for themselves in taking back their neighborhood.

The "Just Say No" Club meets every 2 weeks at Village East. Special programs are offered about safety issues for kids, substance abuse, and even personal grooming. Jones plans tutoring programs using community college students.

Jones relies on her "Just Say No" Club kids to help with all the activities as well. They hand out flyers and announcements, and help decorate for the holiday parties at Halloween and Christmas, the annual Thanksgiving Dinner, the Easter Egg Hunt and other events like skating parties.

Over the years, Jones has connected with resources from all areas to bring much need-

ed programs and services to Village East. She has worked with the city's parks and recreation department providing community input on needed repairs, maintenance, and programs at the centers. She has prodded the city planning department and public works about stop signs and street lights. Public school truant officers have been regulars to the complex, escorting nonresidents off the ground, to their homes, or to school.

County public health has responded to Village East with eye testing and blood pressure clinics. Seniors have benefited from Meals on Wheels and Dial a Ride Transportation. In October 1992, the King School offered a health fair for the neighborhood, and Jones promoted the event for the Village East residents.

At any time, Jones can rely on a core group of 25-30 residents who will assist her efforts to mobilize the complex. It's a tiring task maintaining motivation in people. Setbacks tend to cause discouragement. Constant reinforcement of people's self-esteem and their ability to create change is necessary.

Ella tells a good story about a recent community meeting. She got to the Martin Luther King School auditorium, just a few blocks away, and there were only 25 people from the complex. On the agenda were several city officials including the mayor and chief of police.

She went back to the complex telling people, "You have got to show yourselves at this meeting. I can represent you, but I can't stand up for you. You've got to stand up for yourselves. I don't have no babies, you've got babies to protect. Come on out of your apartments and stand up for yourselves." Back at the auditorium, she had 150 people. "All right," she said. "All right."

Mr. Speaker, Ella's dedication and commitment are an inspiration to all of us.

WORLD WAR II VETERANS MEMORIAL

HON. MARCY KAPTUR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 9, 1993

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD this letter I received regarding legislation I introduced to authorize construction of a World War II Memorial in our Nation's capital.

KANSAS CITY, MO, July 21, 1993.

DEAR CONGRESSWOMAN KAPTUR: I am a World War II veteran who served as a first scout and Combat Infantryman with the 103rd Infantry division in Europe. Through the grace of God and my mother's prayers, I survived the death and destruction that claimed many American soldiers while in defense of our country.

While our nation may be great, almost fifty years have passed with no meaningful or permanent memorial for our World War II veterans. For this reason, I have also been trying for years to fire up our leaders in America to honor those that deserve honor with a World War II memorial in the Washington D.C. area. I have also suggested issuing US commemorative stamps in honor of the POW-MIA's, the combat soldier, and in some way, all the members of our military, male and female.

I have written President Bill Clinton, Veterans Affairs Secretary Jesse Brown, Congressman Alan Wheat, my 5th District Representative from Missouri, and others. Congressman Wheat remains supportive and informed me about your efforts as sponsor of legislation that would create a World War II memorial. I have not heard from President Clinton or Secretary Brown. I guess we all have our own priorities.

I want to take this opportunity to thank you from the bottom of my heart for your untiring efforts. I don't believe World War II veterans want glory or individual recognition, only remembrance. We want to feel needed and appreciated.

I am enclosing correspondence relating to my efforts, including a letter dated July 14, 1993, from the US Postal Services. The example I submitted for a US stamp of the Combat Soldier and his badge of honor could be used for a statue within the World War II memorial. I have other ideas relating to the World War II memorial. I hope members selected for the World War II memorial Advisory Board are knowledgeable and worthy of this honor. Someone like Mr. Roger Durbin.

Please convey the appreciation of this old warrior to all those that supported you in your efforts. There is power in a dedicated few. Our country should consider the fact there will always be trouble spots in the world. We must show appreciation to our old warriors now, in a meaningful way, to indicate to our young defenders what to expect from a grateful nation when they, too, may become old warriors.

Fine ladies have played a major role in my life. My mother who prayed constantly for me during World War II. My sisters who cared and wrote me regularly while I was in military service. My late wife, Rachel, who guided me and supported me for over forty years. Many ladies I have met in volunteer community and church activities. And now, Congresswoman Kaptur, it is an honor to be writing to you to let you know that, although I have never met you, your efforts on behalf of World War II veterans indicates to me that you possess those fine qualities which seemed to have escaped other legislators for so long. May God continue to bless you in all your efforts to retain a sense of humanness in our society.

I have always felt that tears and fears throughout the years were this old soldier's souvenirs. But after almost fifty years, I am finally feeling a sense of accomplishment and peace. World War II may finally be over. I firmly believe that faith, hope, and sheer determination in all fronts gained us victory in World War II.

Please keep me informed on the progress of the World War II memorial and let me know if I can be of any help.

God bless you as He has blessed me, A grateful World War II veteran.

MIKE MORADO.

LEGISLATION TO REPLACE THE COUNCIL ON ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY

HON. GERRY E. STUDDS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 9, 1993

Mr. STUDDS. Mr. Speaker, in February of this year, the President announced his proposal to abolish the Council on Environmental Quality [CEQ] in his effort to streamline the

Federal Government and bring the development of environmental policy closer to the Oval Office. Related to this proposal were initiatives to elevate the Environmental Protection Agency to cabinet level status, the establishment of the White House Office of Environmental Policy, and the reassignment of most of CEQ functions.

Although generally supporting the administration's efforts to recognize some of the environmental functions of the Government, JOHN DINGELL, the father of CEQ and the National Environmental Policy Act [NEPA] in the House, and I, as chairman of the committee with jurisdiction over CEQ and NEPA, asked the White House to explore more fully the broad range of policy matters that would be affected by its proposal.

Chairman DINGELL and I were particularly concerned with the implementation of NEPA, called by many the "Magna Carta" of environmental policy in the United States. CEQ is the institution that administers that law and oversees federal agency compliance with this important 1969 statute.

We wanted to make certain that the key NEPA functions would continue to be administered by a unit codified in law in the Executive Office of the President [EOP] and for which the top officer or director would be accountable to Congress. In these ways, the NEPA unit would be similar to the structure of CEQ. At the same time, we also agreed with the administration that many of the functions in the 1969 NEPA statute or its companion Environmental Quality Improvement Act of 1970 [EQIA] could be transferred to the new cabinet level EPA. We also recognized that, for a few select functions, the President should be able to determine which institution would more effectively serve his environmental policy coordination requirements.

I want to commend the open-mindedness and flexibility with which the administration entered into these discussions. In particular, the White House Office of Environmental Policy, the EPA, and the Office of the Vice President were extremely responsive to our concerns and willing to review the broad range of activities of CEQ that are related to the NEPA process.

After a thorough consideration of all the issues, an agreement with the administration has been reached which protects the integrity of NEPA, addresses the concerns that Chairman DINGELL and I raised and, at the same time, provides the administration with broad discretion for environmental policy development in the White House and a more tightly structured office to focus on NEPA compliance.

One of the most important features of our agreement is the section delineating the core NEPA functions to be carried out by the Office of NEPA Compliance. For the first time, the central NEPA functions will be statutorily specified and consolidated into a single title of NEPA. This will make the new office a leaner unit in the EOP but one for which its mission is abundantly clear and NEPA-specific. Efficient and clear administration of the law should be the result.

This agreement is embodied in the bill that JOHN DINGELL and I have introduced today entitled the National Environmental Policy Act

Administrative Reorganization Amendments of 1993. A summary of the legislation is included with this statement. I intend to present this bill to the Rules Committee as a proposed amendment to the EPA cabinet bill when that legislation is considered in the House. A CEQ provision is in the Senate-passed EPA cabinet bill; thus the issue will be part of the conference committee deliberations.

SUMMARY OF LEGISLATION—NATIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY ACT ADMINISTRATIVE REORGANIZATION AMENDMENTS OF 1993

A new Office of NEPA Compliance will be established in the Executive Office of the President to replace the Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) and the Office of Environmental Quality (OEQ).

The new Office will be headed by a Director who is appointed by the President by, and with the advice and consent of, the Senate. The Director is required to keep the congressional committees of jurisdiction informed about the policies and practices of the Office.

The Office of NEPA Compliance will be a significantly smaller office than the present CEQ. It will have seven professional staff plus support staff and an authorization of \$1 million in Fiscal Year 1994; there will be modest increases in the out years. This compares to a CEQ/OEQ staff of 32 personnel and a budget of \$2.5 million at the end of the last Administration.

In part, this reduction reflects the repeal of the requirement for the mammoth annual CEQ Report, the transfer of a number of functions in existing law to the new Department of Environmental Protection (when that legislation is enacted), the opportunity for the President to assign even further environmental functions to other units in the EOP, and the streamlining of the mission of the new Office to fewer, but critically important, "core" NEPA functions.

Most of the functions now carried in NEPA and EQIA will be transferred directly to the new Department of EPA. These include research, analytical, system evaluation, and data collection activities that can better be carried out by the new cabinet department.

Those functions of CEQ that involve cross-agency appraisals of programmatic contributions to the goals of NEPA and coordination of environmental policies are statutorily granted to the new Office but may be assigned by the President by executive order to another unit in the Executive Office of the President (EOP) or, for certain of these functions, to another federal agency.

Additionally, there are clarifying provisions based on the accepted and historical practice of CEQ in implementing NEPA. These include explicit authority to promulgate NEPA regulations, oversee agency compliance with the regulations, interpret NEPA for federal agencies and citizens, and mediate interagency disputes. These functions are based on present authority in NEPA, various executive orders, or by established CEQ practice. These "core" NEPA functions are granted directly to the Office of NEPA Compliance and may not be reassigned.

LIST OF FUNCTIONS IN NEPA AND THE ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 1970 THAT WOULD BE DIRECTLY TRANSFERRED TO THE NEW DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION

The following functions shall be transferred to EPA and shall not be construed to affect, alter, or amend any other law or regulation administered by the Secretary of the Environment:

(1) Gather timely and authoritative information concerning the conditions and

trends in the quality of the environment both current and prospective, analyze and interpret such information for the purpose of determining whether such conditions and trends are interfering, or are likely to interfere, with the achievement of the policy set forth in NEPA, and compile and submit to the President studies relating to such conditions and trends;

(2) Conduct investigations, studies, surveys, research, and analyses relating to ecological systems and environmental quality;

(3) Document and define changes in the natural environment, including the plant and animal systems, and accumulate necessary data and other information for a continuing analysis of these changes or trends and an interpretation of their underlying causes;

(4) Report at least once each year to the President on the state and condition of the environment;

(5) Review the adequacy of existing systems for monitoring and predicting environmental changes in order to achieve effective coverage and efficient use of research facilities and other resources;

(6) Promote the advancement of scientific knowledge of the effects of actions and technology on the environment and encourage the development of the means to prevent or reduce adverse effects that endanger the health and well-being of man;

(7) Assist the Federal departments and agencies in the development and interrelationship of environmental quality criteria and standards established throughout the Federal Government; and

(8) Collect, collate, analyze, and interpret data and information on environmental quality, ecological research, and evaluation.

EXISTING CEQ/OEQ STATUTORY FUNCTIONS TO BE GRANTED TO THE NEW OFFICE OF NEPA COMPLIANCE BUT ASSIGNABLE BY THE PRESIDENT TO OTHER ENTITIES

Existing statutory language from Title II of NEPA and section 203(d) of EQIA (functions presently carried out by CEQ):

A. The following functions are to be carried out by the Office of NEPA Compliance unless assigned by the President, by executive order, to another unit in the EOP:

(1) Review and appraise the various programs and activities of the Federal Government in light of the policy set forth in Title I of NEPA for the purpose of determining the extent of which such programs and activities are contributing to the achievement of such policy, and make recommendations to the President with respect thereto;

(2) Coordinate the development of recommendations to the President on national policies to foster and promote the improvement of environmental quality to meet the conservation, social, economic, health, and other requirements and goals of the Nation; and

(3) Coordinate or facilitate the development of such studies, reports thereon, and recommendations with respect to matters of policy and legislation as the President may request;

B. The following functions are to be carried out by the Office of NEPA Compliance unless assigned by the President, by executive order, to another unit in the EOP or to another federal agency:

(1) Assist the Federal agencies and departments in appraising the effectiveness of existing and proposed facilities, programs, policies, and activities of the Federal Government, those specific major projects designated by the President which and do not require individual project authorization by

Congress, which affect environment quality; and

(2) Assist in coordinating among the Federal departments and agencies those programs and activities which affect, protect, and improve environmental quality.

"CORE" NEPA FUNCTIONS TO BE CARRIED OUT BY THE OFFICE OF NEPA COMPLIANCE (NONASSIGNABLE)

The following provisions specifying and clarifying NEPA-related functions that have been carried out by CEQ, are necessary to enable the Office of NEPA Compliance to execute NEPA functions, and are directly or indirectly authorized under NEPA or Executive Order 11514 of March 5, 1970, as amended by Executive Order 11991 of May 24, 1977, or historically practiced by CEQ in furtherance of its NEPA responsibilities, are nonassignable:

(1) Promulgate regulations governing the implementation of NEPA by all Federal agencies (including independent regulatory commissions) which include provisions for public review and comment on the detailed statements required by section 102(2)(C) of NEPA and, as appropriate, on other documents prepared pursuant to NEPA;

(2) Mediate interagency disputes and receive referrals of interagency disagreements under section 102(2)(C) of NEPA or matters under section 309(b) of the Clean Air Act for, as appropriate, resolution by the President;

(3) Monitor federal agency implementation of NEPA and the Office's regulations, including: review and approve agency NEPA regulations; determine lead agency for purposes of compliance with NEPA when there is an interagency disagreement; develop alternative NEPA procedures in cases of an emergency; develop alternative NEPA procedures in cases in which there is a change in a proposed agency action or new information becomes available; provide guidance to Federal agencies regarding NEPA implementation; and address such other environmental functions as the President may specify.

TRANSITION PROVISIONS

The bill contains a number of transition provisions to provide for the change from the CEQ and OEQ to the Office of NEPA Compliance, will require a few pages of legislative text to address such matters as:

1. References in other federal laws, executive orders, rules, and regulations;
2. Savings provisions for the continuation of orders, rules, regulations, grants, and other administrative actions;
3. Continuation of proceedings and applications;
4. Suits involving the CEQ or OEQ;
5. Protection for existing CEQ NEPA regulations;
6. Transfer of existing amounts available for CEQ to the Office of NEPA Compliance; and
7. Technical and conforming changes to title I of NEPA and the Environmental Quality Improvement Act.

ORTIZ SALUTES WELDON HILLIS—
PRODUCTION SUPERVISOR,
FORMER PRINTER'S DEVIL, HER-
ALDED FOR 51 YEARS OF SERV-
ICE

HON. SOLOMON P. ORTIZ

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 9, 1993

Mr. ORTIZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to a longstanding friend—my supervisor

in the first real job I had as a teenager—Weldon Hillis. When I was a young teenager, Carroll Keach of the Robstown Record, my hometown newspaper, gave me the first job I ever had—aside from the migrant work with which I helped my family—and that job was one as a printer's devil.

That was when newspaper operations included the old time letterpress system, whereby the printer's devils would tediously apply ink to the assembled characters that made the words, sentences, paragraphs and so on. They called us printer's devils because the work with ink was so filthy. I don't think you could walk through the room without getting dirty.

Weldon Hillis was the linotype operator then, and he supervised all the printer's devils. Weldon had a very unique way of communicating with us—he said nothing, yet we knew exactly what he meant. He would occasionally convey orders to me or one of the other printer's devils to deliver papers downtown.

I always admired, respected, and loved Weldon Hillis. He is a good and decent man who taught me much about the world from my little corner of it in Robstown. That admiration for Weldon Hillis runs deep in our hometown—Weldon is well loved throughout the community.

Weldon retires today after 51 years of service to the newspaper and to our community. He is now the production supervisor for the same publication now named the Nueces County Record-Star, having left the soot of the printer's devil long ago.

Mr. Speaker, today I salute Weldon Hillis and I commend him for his outstanding service to our community over the course of his lifetime. Thank you, Weldon.

APOLLO 11 MOON LANDING COM-
MEMORATIVE COIN TO BENEFIT
MATH AND SCIENCE EDUCATION

HON. CONSTANCE A. MORELLA

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 9, 1993

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce legislation, along with Congressman JIM BACCHUS, my distinguished colleague from the space coast of Florida, authorizing the minting of a silver dollar to commemorate the 25th anniversary of the Apollo 11 landing on the Moon—an epoch journey and one of the greatest achievements of mankind.

In the decade prior to the lunar landing, the U.S. space program captured the imagination of all Americans, especially our Nation's youth.

First, the Mercury Program, then Gemini and the Thundering Apollo missions atop the Saturn V rockets. And then finally, on that special evening of July 20, 1969, the Apollo 11 mission brought Neil Armstrong and Buzz Aldrin—the first humans—to the Moon.

The Apollo 11 lunar landing had been only a dream a decade before, and it was a victory celebrated in many ways. It was a triumph and a wave of reassurance for a nation ill at ease on the battlefield of the cold war. It was also a culmination of President John F. Kennedy's vision.

President Kennedy had announced in May of 1961 that America "should commit itself to achieving the goal, before this decade is out, of landing a man on the Moon and returning him safely to Earth." Accomplishing the feat eventually took 8 years and the work of 400,000 dedicated men and women.

July 20, 1994, marks the 25th anniversary of the Apollo 11 mission. The commemorative silver dollar that this legislation authorizes is a tribute to the thousands of people involved in the space program who made the lunar landing possible. It will serve as a reminder of what can be achieved as a nation when working together for a common goal.

In the 1960's, the space program inspired tens of thousands of students to study engineering and science with an eye toward reaching great milestones of their own. It is appropriate, then, that the legacy of the Apollo program continue to inspire another generation of young people.

A \$10 surcharge on the sale of each silver dollar will go to the Aerospace Education Alliance, a nonprofit organization whose members include the Young Astronaut Council, the Challenger Center for Space Science Education, U.S. Space Camp, Astronaut Memorial Foundation, and the U.S. Space Foundation.

These five leading organizations have come together to assist in Goals 2000, the national strategy to improve math and science education. Among its milestones is the immediate upgrading of the existing teacher work force . . . to improve student performance significantly by the year 2000.

Building on the success of their earlier programs, the Aerospace Education Alliance plans to implement a coordinated strategy of change in America's K-8 teaching process, using aerospace concepts to improve student interest and achievement in math, science, and technology.

The program goal is to provide graduate level instruction for teachers that is recognized as a substantive professional credential. University collaboration will provide academic credit, and a certification process will ensure quality. Evaluation criteria will be established to ensure the effectiveness of the program in the classroom.

Honorary board members of the Aerospace Education Alliance who support this effort include astronauts Buzz Aldrin, Tom Stafford, and Eugene Cernan; former Senator and astronaut Jake Garn; Aerospace Industries Association President Don Fuqua; Planetary Society Executive Director Louis Friedman; Jack Anderson; June Scobee Rogers; John Hendricks, chairman and CEO of Discovery Communications; Lockheed Space Operations President Gerald Oppliger; TRW Director Emeritus Dr. Simon Ramo; CTA Founder and President Tom Velez; John Logsdon, director of the Space Policy Institute at George Washington University; Dr. Edward Fort, Chancellor of North Carolina A&T State University; and Dr. Wes Posvar, president emeritus of the University of Pittsburgh.

Apollo 11 silver dollar is patterned after the successful White House 200th Anniversary coin, released in 1992 and will not compete against larger issue coins such as those produced to support the World Soccer Cup. A contest will be held to select a design, and the

coin will be unveiled and available for sale near the time of the anniversary in July 1994.

The production of the Apollo anniversary silver dollar comes during an era of great change in the world and will serve to remind us of the possibilities for even greater accomplishments in the future. America's teachers will guide our children toward that horizon, and it is particularly appropriate that this anniversary benefit them.

THE BRADY HANDGUN WAITING PERIOD

HON. FORTNEY PETE STARK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 9, 1993

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, this week we will vote on the Brady handgun waiting period. NRA advocates often try to confuse the issue by claiming that waiting periods won't work. I want to share some statistics on the remarkable effectiveness of California's 15-day waiting period and background check which have been in place since 1975 for handguns and 1991 for long guns.

From January, 1991 through September, 1993, California's waiting period stopped 7,017 convicted felons and 7,477 people convicted of misdemeanors from purchasing guns. The following chart, based on data provided by the California Department of Justice, shows the major reasons why purchases were denied.

An ineligible person who buys a gun on the black market is guilty of a public offense—or felony depending on previous offenses—and faces up to a year in jail and a \$1,000 fine. A gun dealer who does not comply with the waiting period or sells a gun to a person he knows or suspects to be ineligible, is guilty of a misdemeanor with the same penalties.

I hope my colleagues will remember the effectiveness of California's law and support the Brady handgun waiting period.

16,420 Illegal gun purchases stopped by California's 15-day waiting period—January 1991 to September 1993

Reason for Denial

	Purchases Denied
Assault or Homicide Conviction	8,060
Drug Conviction	1,959
Theft, Burglary, Robbery, Weapons Offense	1,752
Mental Disorder/Illness	827
Under Age 21	720
Kidnapping, Restraining Order, Sex Crime Conviction	618
All other illegal purchases	2,584
Total	16,420

Source: California Department of Justice

BREAK DOWN BARRIERS: SUPPORT NAFTA

HON. RON PACKARD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 9, 1993

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Speaker, the article from today's San Diego Union-Tribune follows:

[From the San Diego Union-Tribune, Nov. 9, 1993]

SCARE TACTICS USED TO ASSAIL NAFTA

(By Ron Packard)

In his book about the history of our city, author Michael Grant writes, "San Diego, after a long adolescence, has suddenly emerged as a civic Cinderella, ready to take her turn on the international ballroom floor."

Nothing could ring truer. San Diego is poised to lead California out of the economic doldrums. The city is endowed with many resources which will ensure economic leadership into the 21st century. Therefore, I believe we must seize a historic opportunity to capitalize on San Diego's natural gifts. We must support the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) in order to break down barriers and unleash the economic toad. NAFTA opponents have resorted to the usual arguments based on fear and not facts. I would like to enumerate some facts about San Diego's strong stake in passage of NAFTA, and dispel some of these myths about it.

San Diego is the only major U.S. city at the border with Mexico. If an entrepreneur were calculating the benefits that NAFTA would provide to San Diego because of its unique position, he would embrace the agreement as a historic opportunity for our city.

San Diego boasts an educated, young, expanding work force and sound infrastructure and a wealth of high-tech businesses and industries. Nearly 80 percent of all San Diegans in the private sector work for firms of 10 people or less and nearly 90 percent work in firms of 20 people or less. Small businesses, because of their lean structure and an ability to adjust and innovate quickly and creatively, stand to reap huge benefits from exporting their products into the Mexican market of 90 million people, eager for American-made goods.

A report by the Small Business Development and International Trade Center released in 1992 concluded that NAFTA, if enacted, would produce significant benefits for San Diego in every sector. "San Diego is well-placed to become a center of U.S.-Mexican trade and to reap the benefits—as well as sidestep the drawbacks—of the expected increase in border activity."

The San Diego area exports goods and services worth \$1 billion a year to Mexico. In 1992, this figure was 10 percent of San Diego's gross regional product. Lowered tariffs and increased investments after NAFTA if passed are expected to boost that figure by \$200 million to \$300 million a year, for San Diego alone.

The San Diego business community is overwhelmingly supportive of the agreement. A broad cross section of businesses which generate the majority of all jobs in the region has concluded that NAFTA will mean a net increase in jobs nationally and is crucial to the future economic health of the San Diego region.

Among those who informed me of their support of the agreement were Simon Wong, president of the Asian Business Association; Gilbert Partida, president of the Greater San Diego Chamber of Commerce; Robert Lichter, chairman of the CEO Roundtable; Mayor Susan Golding, and Gerri Warren, head of the San Diego County Black Chamber of Commerce.

These business leaders realize that NAFTA will allow San Diego firms to provide linkages and connections for increased trade, investment, services, goods, education and information. It also will open up the Mexican

market to San Diego's most competitive industries, including electronics, medical equipment, computer software, telecommunications equipment and our service sector.

NAFTA opponents' chief arguments are based upon scare tactics and fear. If one believed their rhetoric, the day after NAFTA passed, employers and businesses nationwide would spontaneously decide to flee American soil and relocate south of the border in Mexico. Opponents also say that passage of NAFTA will reduce wages of U.S. workers who will be forced to compete with Mexican wage earners who earn significantly less.

These contentions are not supported by the body of economic evidence, or by decisions most businesses and employers have made, and will continue to make, in the future.

Dire predictions about the giant "sucking sound" of jobs being lost as San Diego companies flee to Mexico are unfounded. What do businessmen and women know that the anti-NAFTA forces do not?

That cheap labor alone is not sufficient enough to bring economic success. If it were, the Dominican Republic would be an economic powerhouse. It is not. No matter how cheap labor is, the bottom line to business is that the work force must have a level of education equal to or greater than the task at hand. U.S. workers are nearly five times more productive than their Mexican counterparts—this more than offsets the lure of cheap labor and provides businesses with a compelling case to remain in San Diego.

Mexico also lacks the superior infrastructure which San Diego provides. Our road and water systems far outdistance those in Mexico. As they have in the past, businesses will continue to think twice about moving production to a country with an antiquated infrastructure.

There are companies which have chosen to relocate to Mexico, taking with them American jobs. However, these jobs were lost primarily because we do not have a free trade agreement with Mexico. Current Mexican trade barriers put U.S. employers and businesses at a competitive disadvantage in Mexico. Businesses must pay a 20 percent tariff on their American-made exports.

With a free trade agreement, San Diego businesses will not have to pay these high tariffs and will not be compelled to move their companies to Mexico in order to compete in the market. Without NAFTA, U.S. companies have an incentive to move to Mexico if they want access to the Mexican market.

New and virtually untapped markets like Mexico are, after all, where profits for business lie. When businesses can expand and grow to meet the increased demand of larger markets, jobs are created. Every \$1 billion in exports supports 20,000 high-wage jobs. In a nutshell, exports equal jobs. NAFTA equals more exports from San Diego, therefore NAFTA means high-skill, high-wage jobs for San Diegans.

NAFTA is key to San Diego's vision of the future. Because of the city's unique resources and position, it will become a gateway to emerging international markets—Mexico, Latin America and the Pacific Rim. If we have the vision to embrace the opportunity of international free trade, to allow our civic Cinderella to truly step out onto the ballroom floor, we must marry her to an economic winner: NAFTA.

TRIBUTE TO JERRY GIUSTRA

HON. SUSAN MOLINARI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 9, 1993

Ms. MOLINARI. Mr. Speaker, on November 21, 1993, friends and colleagues of Mr. Jerry Giustra will gather at the Precious Hearts Association for Exceptional Adults seventh annual dinner and dance in Brooklyn, NY. They will gather to pay tribute to Mr. Giustra's untiring contributions to the betterment of our community. It is truly a pleasure for me to have this opportunity honor Mr. Giustra for being a longtime supporter of Precious Hearts Association, and a community leader in Bensonhurst and Bay Ridge.

Mr. Giustra has always been an important member of his community, and a credit to his country. He served 3 years of active duty in the U.S. Army in World War II. During his time in the military he became a war hero and received various commendations, including a purple heart for bravery when he was shot in the leg while attempting to the aid a fellow American soldier.

He has been an active member in the Kiwanis Club of Bensonhurst and Bay Ridge—Ben-Bay—since 1972. In 1987–88 he became distinguished president. He has been an active member of the Kiwanis Council, Brooklyn Division, and has served as the house chairman for the past four administration. He has chaired and co-chaired a drive, through his club, to raise funds for the Bensonhurst Volunteer Ambulance Service, which resulted in the clubs donation of a fully-equipped ambulance.

He has been a supporter of Precious Hearts Association For Exceptional Adults since 1987. Through Mr. Giustra's love and concern for our mentally handicapped young people, and the generosity of Kiwanis, and, in particular the Kiwanis Club of Bensonhurst and Bay Ridge—Ben-Bay—Precious Hearts For Exceptional Adults has been able to jointly sponsor, with the club, many parties and social activities for young adults, which helps to enhance their self esteem thus giving them a feeling of self worth. Through the continued support of Kiwanis, and their belief in what good people can accomplish together, Precious Hearts has been able to help many who cannot help themselves.

Mr. Speaker, Jerry Giustra is a man who has always extended himself for others, putting the needs of others before his own. It is my pleasure to have the occasion to give thanks to a dedicated family man who has demonstrated both leadership and commitment in improving the quality of life of his neighbors and all the people of Brooklyn.

RABBI EDWARD AND SARAH GARSEK RECOGNIZED

HON. MARCY KAPTUR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 9, 1993

Mr. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I rise today in recognition of

Rabbi Edward and Sarah Garsek who will receive the State of Israel Award on November 16 for their continued support of the congregation, our community as well as Israel's economic development through investments in Israel bonds.

Rabbi Garsek has dedicated his life to the service of his community. Beginning in 1975, he has been an outstanding spiritual leader in the Etz Chayim Congregation, and teacher at the Toledo Board of Jewish Education Schools in the Hebrew Academy, the High School for Jewish Studies and the Adult Institute of Jewish Studies. Rabbi Garsek also teaches bible and codes classes for the Congregation Etz Chayim. He also serves as the chaplain for the Ohio State prisons and mental institutions.

Rabbi Garsek received his rabbinical ordination from the Hebrew Theological College in Skokie, IL, and a bachelor of Hebrew literature and a master of pastoral counseling. He also holds a Masters degree in Education from the University of Toledo and a bachelor of arts in history and philosophy from Loyola University in Chicago, IL.

Rabbi Garsek has lent his abilities to many organizations by serving on their board of executives. Some of the organizations that he serves in this capacity include the Rabbinical Council of America, the Hebrew Academy of Toledo, the Toledo Jewish Book Fair, and the Toledo Jewish Educator's Council. In addition, he has served on the organizational boards of the Economic Opportunity Planning Association of Greater Toledo, Inc. [EOPA], and continues to serve on the Foundation for Life, Toledo B'nai B'rith Lodge No. 183, the Mental Health Association of Greater Toledo, the Toledo Board of Jewish Education, Toledo Jewish Home for the Aged, the Toledo Jewish Family Service, the Toledo Jewish Community Center and the Toledo Jewish Federation of Greater Toledo.

Beginning with her great grandfather, Sara Garsek has always been part of a rabbinical family. She serves on the Cherva Kadisha and is Mikvah Attendant for the Netay Etz Chayim Synagog and previously served as president. She is also the previous vice president of Etz Chayim Sisterhood and ORT. For the past 12 years Sara has been a community Hebrew school teacher and a Hebrew teacher at the Hebrew Academy. She continues to give of herself tirelessly, providing behind the scenes support and serving as a visible symbol of Jewish hospitality.

In addition to their selfless contributions to the community, the Garseks have successfully raised six children: Cheryl Ester, Deborah Elka, Zev Yosef, Shoshana Ruth, Rachael Nachama, and Yitzchak Raphael.

Mr. Speaker, I am privileged to represent these extraordinary people. I ask that my colleagues join me today in extending our heartfelt congratulations to the Garseks on the receipt of this much deserved award.

DEMOCRACY IN RUSSIA

HON. JOHN T. DOOLITTLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 9, 1993

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Mr. Speaker, last month as we watched Boris Yeltsin's courageous

struggle against the hardline communists in Moscow, Robert H. Kriebel and Paul M. Weyrich of the Kriebel Institute were eye-witnesses to this historic event. Mr. Kriebel and Mr. Weyrich have been training Russian and eastern European leaders in the principles of democracy ever since the opening up of the former communist bloc. They were on such a training mission when the siege of the Russian White House began. I have submitted for the RECORD their account of these exciting events.

THE KRIEBEL INSTITUTE,

Washington, DC, October 8, 1993.

DEAR FRIEND: We would be hard pressed to convey to you our thoughts on that dark Sunday night of October 3rd as we headed for Moscow and an uncertain fate.

We had completed our second training conference in Voronezh and were headed for Novosibirsk. On the chartered bus taking us to the airport, radio Moscow reported that former Russian Vice President Alexander Rutskoi had dispatched a mob of 10,000 armed communists to take over City Hall, the main television channel, the central communications center and other key facilities. "Civil war has begun in the streets of Moscow," the newscaster announced.

Once inside the airport we learned that our flight to Novosibirsk has been cancelled and no flight was available for days. We managed to get booked aboard an old turbo prop leaving for Moscow two hours later. Meanwhile, we heard that special forces units had defected from the Yeltsin side and were assisting Rutskoi.

A black gloom descended over our group. As we boarded that small plane there was none of the excitement and banter usually associated with our travelling troupe. There are usually seven or eight of us who teach, several interpreters, some of our fieldmen and logistical people. We have a great time on these trips as it is an adventure to go to the far reaches of the old Soviet Empire to speak of freedom and democracy.

But who could think of that now? The flight was less than two hours but it seemed an eternity. Our usually upbeat Moscow director Mikhail Reznikov was more troubled than we had ever seen him. The interpreters—one quietly sobbing—spoke of their families and worried for their safety.

We, who have spent years now laboring in this vineyard, wondered if it had all been in vain. We knew that if the Rutskoi group prevailed our Russian staff would be in immediate danger. We knew we must see to their well being, as association with us had made them marked people.

Mikhail Reznikov's brother Yuri met us at the regional airport. There in the dim light in the cold of a Russian fall, he gave us the latest. The communists had taken over City Hall. They had captured Ostankino, the main Russian TV facility. They were on their way to the central news agency and the Moscow police had collapsed and all but disappeared.

What of Yeltsin's response? We were told there had been no response. No one could understand what was happening.

On that long, long ride from the regional airport to the international airport hotel where—without reservations—we had determined to stay to insure communication with the outside world, we passed an armored personnel carrier being driven by uniformed troops and trucks with soldiers huddled in the back. What did it mean?

When at last we reached the hotel we were told the news was worse. Dozens dead at Ostankino. Eight different attacks all over the city and the Communist mob on its way

to the Kremlin. Rutskoi had said it was time to oust Yeltsin.

"Don't worry," said Reznikov. "These criminals won't defeat the majority of the Russian People."

He wasn't kidding. For after he left us, he and thousands of others committed to freedom and democracy formed units to create a blockade to prevent the communist advance on the Kremlin. They had no weapons. But to capture Yeltsin the criminal band would have had to kill thousands of their fellow citizens who erected barricades with old bathtubs and street sweeper equipment and trucks and cars.

Together they waved the Russian flag and sang songs of freedom all night. Former Moscow police chief Arkady Murashev emerged as the chairman of the "Committee to Protect Moscow". Neighborhood groups—in anticipation this day might come—had practiced working together in small regiments. Murashev dispatched them to guard every cross street for miles leading to the Kremlin.

Meanwhile a stunned Boris Yeltsin returned to the Kremlin from his summer home by helicopter. He came to a disorganized and chaotic Kremlin where, as one reporter who stayed inside the Kremlin walls put it, "Indecision reigned. It was not a pretty sight."

To the rescue came two old colleagues of Yeltsin. Mikhail Poltoranin and Gennady Burbulis. Burbulis and Yeltsin had not spoken since, under Communist pressure last December, Yeltsin sacked his life long friend who had masterminded the end of the Soviet Union.

But this was a crisis and Burbulis, the brilliant strategic thinker, understood what was at stake even more than Yeltsin did. Burbulis and Poltoranin took command and began to bring order out of chaos. By late Sunday night a spokesman for Yeltsin emerged to say there would be a response—that the insurrection would be broken.

All night they planned the attack. In the morning tanks advanced on the Russian White House. Because the media had bought the false report that the Special Forces had defected to Rutskoi, when the tanks appeared on Moscow streets, no one was sure if they were there to help Yeltsin or to defend Rutskoi.

It turned out that there were no defections. Rutskoi, fervently believing that he would have a third of the armed forces with him, now pleaded with those he thought would defect to come forward. None did. This was consistent with information given to us a week earlier when two high ranking colonels of the Air Force assured us that the armed forces would be loyal to Yeltsin. They laughed heartily when we asked about rumored defections.

As we watched the events unfolding on television we were talking hour by hour to our various friends in the Democracy movement.

Late in the morning, we headed for downtown and the Freedom and Democracy House, which only 10 days earlier had been dedicated by Burbulis, Mstislav Rostropovich (the conductor of the Washington National Symphony, who years ago had defected but who is now helping Yeltsin) and the two of us in front of a large gathering of the most ardent democrats, many of them part of the Yeltsin government.

Far from the merriment of that gala reception to commemorate the opening of this Freedom and Democracy House where The Kriebel Institute now has its permanent headquarters in Russia (44 Gercen Street), the place was now a madhouse of people

rushing about with the latest information of sniper fire or troop action. An assistant to Murashev prepared a list of Communist groups for Yeltsin to outlaw.

In the background we could hear small arms fire and the occasional thump of cannon fire from the tanks surrounding the White House.

We pleaded with our cautious hosts to take us where the action was. They urged us not to go—citing those killed and injured by stray gunfire. But the stand for democracy was too dear not to take the chance, so we headed for Freedom Square—so named after the triumph of Yeltsin following the 1991 coup attempt.

There along the Moscow River we made our way alongside the thousands of Muscovites who turned out to witness history. At last we were there—a few feet from one of the active tanks looking at the incredible sight of fire and smoke pouring from the upper floors of the White House. Gunfire echoed everywhere and, as the military responded, the crowd panicked and nearly trampled us. We hung on to each other for safety.

Presently a column of police marched across the overpass above us, their shiny shields glistening in the sun of the beautiful October afternoon. At once the police came down the steps from the overpass to the street along the Moscow River where we stood transfixed in the middle of the revolution.

Soon men with their hands on their heads were marched down the stairs and were told to face the retaining wall. This was surrender. The siege of the White House was ending.

Above us Rutskoi and Parliamentary Speaker Ruslan Khasbalatov were being ushered into a bus to be carted off to prison. The gunfire continued unabated. But the battle was won.

The smell of gunpowder, the faces of those who surrendered, the blackened White House—these were sights which shall live with us forever.

We rushed to Tverskaya Prospect, the large street leading directly to the Kremlin, which was filled with citizens as all traffic had been blocked by the barricades. There in front of the old city council chambers we stood with eager—mostly young—democrats waiting for the latest word. As Russian flags flew everywhere, a man stepped out on the third floor balcony and spoke slowly in distinct tones to the crowd. "They are coming forth with white flags. They are surrendering," he said and the crowd went wild. Democracy had triumphed. There we were witnessing the finish of the second October Revolution. How different the ending this time! How blessed we were to have been a part of that extraordinary moment.

Late that night as we watched the fire continue to rage at the Russian White House our thoughts moved back to the happier times we had spent there. Our meeting with Yeltsin, our midnight meeting with Burbulis. The training conference we had conducted there for the pro-democracy members of the Russian Parliament. (Russian Democrats have told us that, were it not for our early training, Yeltsin would never had had the support necessary to get elected by the parliament in the first place and without that crucial first event, he likely would not have been there to act in this time of crisis.)

Yes, to save democracy, Yeltsin had to destroy the parliament.

We then heard a report that a list had been captured at the parliament building with the

names of the reformers on it. Included in this list were our associates! Had Rutskoi won, they were to have been rounded up. The document even included instructions to customs officials to detain any who might try to leave the country.

Indeed we had stayed here to insure that, if need be, we could get them out of the country. Had Rutskoi won, our people and not Rutskoi and Khasbulatov would have been in prison. We shudder to think of it.

Now the real work begins in earnest. Much of what we have done here these past five years has been leading up to this moment.

Alexei Golovkov, an assistant to Deputy Prime Minister Egor Gaidar told us Tuesday that, in the next two weeks, Yeltsin intended to move swiftly to dismantle the remaining Communist structures throughout Russia. No doubt there will be pressure from the West for him to stop this.

But such dismantling is necessary if there are to be truly free and fair elections. In rural areas and regions of Siberia the old structures are fully in place. They must be removed and this is Yeltsin's window to do so.

As for the work of The Kriebel Institute, our efforts could hardly have been more timely. A hugely successful conference in Perm, for example, has prepared the democratic forces there for the upcoming elections. We intend to be very active between now and the elections.

And our efforts on behalf of a market economy now should be stepped up. We believe private property will be completely legal in a matter of a few months. Title of ownership can be defended in the courts at every level. This is what foreign capital has been waiting for. The sort of progress we expected two years ago can now take place. For the first time can we honestly recommend business investment in Russia.

Few people ever get a chance to see history in the making. We consider ourselves greatly blessed that we have been a part of this continuing saga as true change comes to Russia.

As remarkable as our memories have been these past years, Monday, October 4, 1993, is one day we shall never, ever, forget. The day the Communists lost the Second October Revolution.

Sincerely,

ROBERT H. KRIEBLE.
PAUL M. WEYRICH.

MY VOICE IN AMERICA'S FUTURE

HON. JIM BACCHUS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 9, 1993

Mr. BACCHUS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I insert the following for the RECORD:

MY VOICE IN AMERICA'S FUTURE

(By Kris Havens, Florida winner, 1992/93 VFW Voice of Democracy Scholarship Program)

On a dark stage, an actor waited. Suddenly a small yet brilliant spotlight grew, as if it gave life to the actor. It was at this time when that person could say anything, do anything, be anything, knowing that he would affect every member in the audience. The greatest playwright, William Shakespeare, once expressed, "The world is a stage." If this is true, then we are all the actors. Through our actions and voice we will touch each other.

Voice.

This five letter word presents not only the verbal, but the nonverbal actions as well. If a person looks deep enough into this word, they may be able to see how each letter represents a different performance. Those activities are the ones where the power of My Voice rings.

"V" represents Volunteer. Just as the spotlight grows and gives life to one actor, the performance of volunteering gives hope to many players. It is true, people are ripped out of their homes by environmental disasters. It is true, some children go to bed hungry. It is true, we all are vulnerable to incurable diseases. No matter what the case, everyone needs one thing—aid. Whether it's one's money, one's time, or one's heart, it helps. Edward G. Bulwer-Lytton once said, "When a person is down in the world, an ounce of help is better than a pound of preaching." When I attend Project Response and hug those unfortunate people who have acquired the HIV virus, or even worse, AIDS, nonverbally the power of My Voice rings.

"O" stands for Opinions. Before the cast is picked and any staging is done, it is the director who performs first, by deciding on how to interpret the play. In this remarkable country the people are free to believe in anything they desire. Thomas Mann once said, "Opinions cannot survive if one has no chance to fight for them." I will fight for my opinion in public forums, through voting and serving my country in military service. As I prepare myself for these duties, in the end the power of My Voice rings.

"I" represents being informed. The entire cast and crew of a play must take on the responsibility of being aware of what is going on at all times. Going through life blindfolded shows ignorance and weakness. We must keep in touch with what is going on in our city, state, country, and world. "America is not just a nation but a nation of nations," stated our 36th President of the United States, Lyndon B. Johnson. We must not ignore any problems that occur in this world; because in the end, it may be on our doorsteps and more likely, too difficult to control. By picking up a newspaper and reading more than just the comics and horoscope, softly, the power of My Voice rings.

"C" stands for Choice. An actor may choose many ways to portray his character to display the best of his talents. Everyone, as a United States citizen, has to choose to speak up for change. William James believed, "When you have to make a choice and don't make it, that in itself is a choice." I choose to be proud of my country, and its flag, and its opportunities. By choosing to act on these convictions, the power of My Voice rings.

"E" represents Education. Without light, nothing breathes on stage. Without knowledge, the light in a man's mind is dark. One must know the past to prevent future decisions from failing. One must know the present, as well, to aid in the future. "Education is growth * * * Education is not a preparation for life; education is life itself," explained Professor John Dewey. By enrolling myself in challenging classes and helping those struggling to gain knowledge, the power of My Voice rings.

The words from Johnson, Shakespeare, Dewey symbolize how the power of Their Voices still ring. Yet not only can their words be recalled, but their performances as well, therefore, I choose that my deeds speak for me through volunteering, holding opinions on current issues, staying informed, making choices, and striving for the best education possible. The power of My Voice Will Ring in America's Future!

THE CLAIM OF GIBBS & HILL, INC., AGAINST THE GOVERNMENT OF SAUDI ARABIA

HON. ROBERT E. ANDREWS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 9, 1993

Mr. ANDREWS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to insert in the RECORD a statement I made at the October 21 meeting of the Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on Europe and the Middle East. This statement and the questions contained in it were directed at the witness before the subcommittee, Assistant Secretary of State for Near Eastern Affairs, Edward Djerejian. Mr. Djerejian was and continues to be responsive to my concerns and the serious concerns of other members of the committee on this issue of unresolved claims of United States corporations against the Government of Saudi Arabia.

STATEMENT FOR CONGRESSMAN ROBERT ANDREWS BEFORE THE EUROPE AND MIDDLE EAST SUBCOMMITTEE, OCTOBER 21, 1993

Mr. Assistant Secretary. I would like to make a brief statement and ask a few questions about an issue which greatly concerns me.

My comments relate to the resolution of the remaining long outstanding commercial disputes involving American companies and the Government of Saudi Arabia, which was the subject of the report submitted by the Department of Defense in June of this year, and specifically the resolution of the claim of Gibbs & Hill, Inc.

It is my responsibility and the responsibility of this committee to insure that the Saudi Government honors its commitment to expeditiously and fairly resolve the remaining unpaid claims of American companies noted in the DOD report. It is also my responsibility and the responsibility of this committee to insure that our Government, and specifically the Departments of State, Commerce and Defense fulfill their commitments to these American companies to bring about the fair and expeditious resolution of their claims.

Gibbs & Hill, Inc., an internationally recognized engineering company, with a large number of employees located in my district, was noted in the DOD report as one of the last claims remaining to be resolved by the Saudi Embassy. Gibbs & Hill had provided design and engineering services to the Saudi Government for the Yanbu Industrial City in the late 1970's. Gibbs & Hill incurred significant additional costs as a result of the Saudi Government's failure to perform its contract obligations. At the time that Gibbs & Hill's additional costs were incurred, the Saudi Government committed to fairly compensate Gibbs & Hill for these additional costs. However, the Saudi Government failed to live up to this commitment, and the Saudi grievance system also failed to equitably adjudicate Gibbs & Hill's claim.

The Saudi Ambassador, Prince Bandar Bin Sultan, had personally committed to me and other of my colleagues in the Congress in writing that the claim of Gibbs & Hill would be resolved in a "fair and expeditious manner" and that "no effort" would be spared in resolving Gibbs & Hill's claim. The DOD report stated that it had received the same assurances regarding the Gibbs & Hill claim from the Saudi Embassy and had also been assured that the Saudi Government would

"proceed with determination and diligence to negotiate satisfactory conclusions to the remaining claims." Similar assurances had also been given the Departments of State and Commerce by the Saudi Government with regard to the Gibbs & Hill claim.

The Saudi Government has failed to live up to its commitments to me, my colleagues, this committee and our Government. Despite the multiple assurances by the Saudi Embassy that the claim of Gibbs & Hill would now be fairly resolved, Ambassador Bandar in a recent letter to me, as well as to Secretaries Christopher, Brown, and Aspin, reported that his Government's review of Gibbs & Hill's claim concluded that Gibbs & Hill was not entitled to payment of its additional costs. Ambassador Bandar's letter also wrongly accused Gibbs & Hill of attempting to bypass the Saudi grievance system, when, in fact, Gibbs & Hill was one of the few claimants identified in the DOD report who had fully complied with this system. In reaching its conclusion, the Saudi Government did not review documents repeatedly offered by Gibbs & Hill regarding the merits of its claim. Ambassador Bandar also contradicted his previous actions in resolving claims listed in the DOD report by stating that he could not intervene in cases which had been prosecuted under the Saudi grievance system.

The Saudi Government's review of Gibbs & Hill's claim and its conclusions as stated in Ambassador Bandar's letter are not acceptable to me, nor to this committee, and should not be acceptable to our branches of our Government. The actions by the Saudi Government are nothing more than a continuation of the unfair treatment and unfulfilled commitments to which Gibbs & Hill has been subjected for more than 12 years.

On September 24, I wrote to Secretary Christopher, as well as to Secretaries Brown and Aspin, to express my extreme displeasure at the continued unfair treatment of Gibbs & Hill by the Saudi Government and asked them to report to me what actions our Government intended to take to insure that the Saudi Government fulfills its commitments to Gibbs & Hill to expeditiously and fairly resolve its long outstanding claim.

Therefore, Mr. Secretary, I ask you today:

1. What actions are you taking to insure that Gibbs & Hill's claim is paid now.
2. As you know, Gibbs & Hill got all the commitments for resolution from the Saudi Government when the claims issue was hot. Then, when many of the claims were taken out, the story changed, perhaps because the pressure was off. I am here today to tell you that the pressure is back on. I am also here to urge you to join this committee in applying that pressure for satisfactory resolution of Gibbs & Hill's claim so we can quickly end this unfortunate chapter in our bilateral relationship.

I will quickly conclude this by assuring you that I, and this committee, will continue to push our Government and the Saudi Government for as long as is necessary to ensure that Gibbs & Hill's claim is paid.

TRIBUTE TO IRENE H.
IMPELLIZZERI, PH.D.

HON. SUSAN MOLINARI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 9, 1993

Ms. MOLINARI. Mr. Speaker, on November 21, 1993, friends and colleagues of Dr. Irene

Impellizzeri will gather at the Precious Hearts Association for Exceptional Adults Seventh Annual Dinner and Dance in Brooklyn, NY. They will gather to pay tribute to Dr. Impellizzeri's untiring contributions to the betterment of our community. It is truly a pleasure for me to have this opportunity to honor Dr. Impellizzeri for being a distinguished member of the education community and for doing so much to further the education of special education students.

As a teacher, researcher, administrator, psychologist and community worker, Dr. Impellizzeri has crowded many accomplishments into an intense professional career. At each phase of her career, she had manifested a striking commitment to people. Even as she has responded to the myriad new challenges confronting the educational community in New York City, especially in the last few years, she has never lost her basic belief in the value of each individual and the potential of each student.

From her early days as the teacher in the elementary and secondary schools, then at the university level, and now as vice president of the New York City Board of Education, Dr. Impellizzeri has always focused her interests and energy on students. With successive degrees from New York University, Columbia University Teacher's College, and Fordham University, she moved from adjunct professor at Fordham University to professor at Brooklyn College where she became department chairman, and, in 1971 dean of The School of Education. In January 1987, she was appointed by the board of trustees of The City University of New York to the position of university dean for teacher education, a post from which she retired in July, 1991.

Mr. Speaker, Dr. Impellizzeri, is a woman who has always extended herself for others, putting the needs of others before her own. It is my pleasure to have the occasion to give thanks to a dedicated educator who has demonstrated both leadership and commitment in improving the quality of life of youth at all ages and levels of proficiency.

THE 55TH ANNIVERSARY OF
KRISTALLNACHT

HON. BOB FRANKS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 9, 1993

Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, today marks the 55th commemoration of the Nazi pogroms in Germany and Austria known as Kristallnacht, the Night of the Broken Glass.

On the evening of November 9 and morning of November 10, 1938, the Gestapo methodically orchestrated the destruction of selected targets within the Third Reich, including 275 synagogues and 7,500 Jewish businesses. Kristallnacht resulted in 91 Jewish deaths and 30,000 deportees to concentration camps.

This event was not an isolated incident. Instead, Kristallnacht marked the intensification of the 5-year, anti-Semitic program initiated by Hitler in 1933 and signaled the beginning of the Holocaust. This event, and the ensuing

horror, terror, and inhumanity that defined Hitler's reign, happened because otherwise decent, caring people let it happen.

A half century later, here in our own country, there has been an alarming rise in crimes motivated by hate or religious, ethnic, and racial intolerance. Last year alone in my home State of New Jersey there were over 1,300 incidents of bias crimes. That represents a 34-percent increase from the previous year.

Mr. Speaker, on the 55th commemoration of Kristallnacht, we must commit ourselves to ensuring that such intolerance has no place in our society. Only through our sustained vigilance can we guarantee that such atrocities are neither forgotten nor repeated.

THIRD BAPTIST CHURCH
CELEBRATES 125 YEARS

HON. MARCY KAPTUR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 9, 1993

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I rise today in recognition of the 125th anniversary celebration of the Third Baptist Church, the oldest African-American Baptist congregation in Toledo. Spanning a century and a quarter, Third Baptist Church enjoys a rich, deep history beginning in 1868 and continuing through to the present. In the early years, the congregation took strong leadership roles in the community and nurtured the birth of the Indiana Avenue YMCA, the Colored Girls Working Home and the Frederick Douglass Community Center. While community involvement took a firm hold, the structure of the church was manifested with a strong and active Sunday School and Missionary Society. Two of the five church clubs, the Willing Workers and the Y.W. Senior Clubs were also formed.

It was during this time that the church grew from a one-room frame structure to the edifice at its present location under the diligent leadership of Dr. Benjamin F. McWilliams, a man with courage, determination, and vision. He was well respected in the community, undertaking the most ambitious building program of its kind with the purchase of real estate and later construction on the site. The church was completed in three units from 1915 to 1927, each unit completely paid for before construction on the next began.

In 1933, Rev. Calvin Stalnaker became pastor of Third Baptist when Dr. McWilliams' health began to fail. It was a challenging period due to the tremendous progress made during this 10-year tenure. At that time there was phenomenal growth in the church membership, the budget was met, and the mortgage was paid in full.

Upon his resignation in 1944, Rev. Elliot J. Mason was elected pastor and remained the next 15 years. Reverend Mason's contributions were numerous, including an expansion program and completion of the church annex. In the years to follow, the church continued to grow spiritually under the vigorous leadership of Rev. H.W. Mason, Rev. Vincent M. Brown, Dr. Finis H. Austin, Dr. H. Clark Nabrit, and Rev. Donald Washington.

Today, with nearly 500 members under the dynamic leadership of Dr. Langston C. Bannister, the church has broadened its horizons even more. To his credit, significant projects have been completed including renovation of the kitchen and addition of a new roof.

Major improvements in the sanctuary are also being implemented. Dr. Bannister recognizes that the church has always been a protector and a provider for African-American people.

It has always given them the faith and hope needed to survive and grow in a sometimes hostile environment, thereby sustaining the needed outreach ministry into the community. Support programs such as youth development through the Cub Scouts, Boy Scouts, and Girl Scouts, the Pastor's Pantry, bus and tape ministry and Feed Your Neighbor have been implemented. These are tremendous resources within our community. The church also offers financial planning services, group discussions

addressing the needs of single parents, as well as a multifaceted counseling program. Food baskets are given to numerous families during Thanksgiving and Christmas. Additionally, the congregation is very supportive and participates in the local Angel Tree Program.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that my colleagues join me today in extending our heartfelt congratulations of Third Baptist Church on its 125th Anniversary. May the congregation continue to enrich our community for many years to come.